

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



**A study and edition of lope de Vega's El Mayordomo de La Duquesa de Amalfi.**

Bradbury, G

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

**END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT**



**Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page** this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

.1.  
401

A STUDY AND EDITION OF  
LOPE DE VEGA'S EL MAYORDOMO DE LA DUQUESA  
DE AMALFI

Thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy of the University  
of London

by

Gail Bradbury

September, 1977

Department of Spanish,  
King's College

### Abstract

I have taken the text of this Lope play primarily from the London edition of Parte XI. Variants from two other editions of the same Parte, an eighteenth-century manuscript copy, and the Academia version are noted at the foot of each page, and the text is followed by explanatory notes. The introductory chapter discusses the sources, texts, dating and versification of the play.

The second and third chapters are closely related to the question of Lope's sources. They deal, respectively, with Lope's adaptations of Bandello novelle, and with El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi as the Spanish counterpart of John Webster's The Duchess of Malfi. The conclusions are that Lope worked mainly from the Italian Bandello, producing careful and ideative dramatizations, that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is radically different from, but in no way inferior to, Webster's work, and that Webster did not copy Lope.

The following chapter is based on the argument that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is typical of Lope's revolutionary conception of "impure tragedy", and the last three sections are devoted to a general study of the social issues germane to this play. Chapter five traces the evolvement of Spanish attitudes towards "new nobles" and interclass marriage, between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. Chapter six sets out to show that Lope dramatized these social conflicts in many different ways, and that he gave particular support to the controversial notion of the mésalliance.

The study finishes with a chapter on inverted sexuality. The conclusions are that real-life Spanish attitudes towards masculine women and effeminate men were not universally censorious, and that many of Lope's plays - including El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi - adopt a tolerant approach to this contemporary topic, treating it, metaphorically, as one aspect of the perennial "battle of the sexes".

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	4
-----------------------	---

### PART I

I.	Introduction to <u>El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi</u> .....	6
II.	Lope Plays Based on Bandello Stories.....	19
III.	Webster's <u>The Duchess of Malfi</u> and Lope's <u>El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi</u> : a Comparison.....	40
IV.	Lope and the "tragedia al estilo español".....	55
V.	The Social Background.....	76
VI.	The Social Issues Dramatized.....	137
VII.	The Amazon and the Fop.....	152
	The Date of <u>El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi</u> .....	187
	The Texts of <u>El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi</u> .....	189
	Synopsis of the Versification.....	198
	Bibliography of Works Cited.....	200

### PART II

The Text of <u>El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi</u> :		
	Act I.....	1
	Act II.....	36
	Act III.....	68
	Notes to the Text.....	97



## Acknowledgements

While writing this thesis I have been helped on many occasions by the staff of the libraries in King's College, Senate House and the British Museum. My thanks are also due to Professor H.G. Koenigsberger who gave me suggestions for historical background reading, and to Miss Marie-Christine Kerr for many enlightening and stimulating discussions. Most of all, however, I should like to thank my supervisor, Mr. J.W. Sage, for his unfailing help, interest and encouragement.

PART I

## Chapter I

### Introduction to El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi

Although El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi has never ranked among the acknowledged Lopean masterpieces, it merits attention on several accounts. Quite apart from the fact that it has a famous English counterpart in Webster's The Duchess of Malfi, it belongs to that interesting group of works which Lope based on Bandello novelle, and also constitutes a good example of his revolutionary conception of tragedy. In addition, it treats in a distinctive manner two of the topics most central to Lope's theatre: the strong woman/weak man partnership, and the breakdown of traditional social barriers. These areas of general Lopean interest will each be explored separately here, but we should begin by setting out the data relevant to the play itself, and by attempting to evaluate it per se.

### Critical Work to Date

At the end of the last century Adolf Friedrich von Schack and Karl Kiesow noted the existence of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi, comparing it unfavourably with Webster's play. A few years later, Domenico Morellini gave it a brief and slighting mention in his important work on the historical foundations of the Amalfi legend, and in subsequent studies Antonio Gasparetti, F.L. Lucas, John E. Houseman and Gunnar Boklund analysed in some detail the differences between the Lopean and the Websterian reworkings of the Bandello tale.<sup>1</sup> All along, however, the tendency has been to view Lope's play as a foil for Webster's, and the assumption that the Spanish work is a standard and unremarkable comedia de capa y espada has stood largely unchallenged. This supposition is one with which I shall later have occasion to argue. Nevertheless,



we are indebted to the above-mentioned scholars - Morellini, Boklund and Lucas particularly - for their research on the sources of both English and Spanish dramatists, and their unearthing of the facts behind the Amalfi tale. Incomplete as the historical picture is in places, I have been able to add little to the information culled, and am mainly limited to a recapitulation of what these critics have already established.

### The Historical Background

Born in 1478, Giovanna d'Aragona was the daughter of Enrico d'Aragona, bastard son of Ferdinand I of Naples. Her older brothers, Luigi and Carlo, quickly became influential personages, the former rising to the position of Cardinal, and thereby transferring to the latter the hereditary title of Marquis of Gerace. In 1497 Giovanna herself was married to Alfonso Piccolomini I, Duke of Amalfi. He died a year later, however, leaving her with a young son, also called Alfonso. It is assumed that her second marriage - to Antonio Bologna, a member of the minor nobility of Bologna, and the majordomo of her household - took place sometime between the years 1498 and 1509. Certainly, a contemporary diarist, Giacomo della Morte, records an unexpected and ominous visit from her brothers in 1509. The same chronicler tells us that on November the seventeenth of the following year Giovanna set out, ostensibly on a pilgrimage to Loreto, but ultimately for the nearby Ancona, where she caused a scandal by publicizing her secret marriage to Antonio and renouncing her title. In 1513 Antonio was murdered in Milan, Giovanna, her maid and two of her children having been disposed of - probably in Amalfi itself - some months earlier. The eldest child of their marriage, a boy of seven years or less, seems to have escaped and spent the rest of his life in comfortable obscurity.<sup>2</sup>

The Duchess's eldest son, by her first marriage, ruled as Duke of Amalfi until 1559. Interestingly, he was married to Constanza di Inigo Davalos, cousin of the famous bluestocking, Vittoria Colonna, and was



sufficiently sympathetic towards his mother and his stepfather to name two of his own children after them.<sup>3</sup> These two facts, when taken together, help to suggest that the Duchess's story may well have circulated in oral, as well as written, forms, in sixteenth-century Spain. One cannot, of course, assume that Lope's portrayal of the young Duke of Amalfi as a supporter of his mother's cause, reflects an inside knowledge of the facts behind the Amalfi legend. Nevertheless, this feature of the Spanish work does not derive from any of the written versions of the tale, and the fame enjoyed by Vitoria Colonna - Lope himself includes her as a character in one of his plays<sup>4</sup> - strengthens the possibility of a special interest in seventeenth-century Spain in the affairs and exploits of this particular branch of the Neapolitan nobility. Furthermore, Antonio's namesake (Antonio, Marchese di Capestrano, 1521-1539) spent some years serving as a page in the Spanish court, so the likelihood of Lope's having been acquainted with details of the Amalfi history not included in the novelistic versions, cannot be entirely discounted. This brings up the question of the primary and secondary sources of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi.

### The Sources

It is generally supposed that novel I.26 of Matteo Bandello's collection, in its original Italian, rather than elaborated French, version, furnished Lope with his main source. This account of the Amalfi legend corresponds substantially with the facts as we know them. It omits only the escape of Antonio's eldest son, and the sympathetic attitude of the young Duke, and adds but a few details pertinent to the courtship and final murders. These may, or may not, carry the weight of eye-witness testimony.<sup>5</sup> Variant versions of the story, to be found among the Corona manuscripts, have been dismissed by Morellini and Boklund as unlikely Lopean source material, because of their dependence on the Bandello account. Gasparetti has suggested that the dramatist may have added to the Bandello basis details drawn from

Cervantes's La señora Cornelia (Novelas ejemplares, published 1613), and number II.6 of Giraldi Cinthio's Gli Ecatommisti. My own view is that although Lope probably did rely primarily on Bandello (in the Italian version), he may well have been influenced by variant Italian versions of the legend, and that while he may possibly have borrowed his "baby" incident (II.251-320) from a manuscript version of the Cervantes work, he is unlikely to have drawn on Giraldi for the gory details of his denouement.

### Lope and Bandello

The argument that Lope took most of his Bandello-based plays from the Italian, rather than the French, version of the novelle, is one which I shall develop elsewhere. Therefore, it is only necessary to note here that the Belleforest transcription of novel I.26 does not deviate from the essentials of the original. It merely adds to the narrative long passages of moralistic commentary - directed against both the lovers and the murderers - and includes in the finale some, not very relevant, verses. In fact, were it not for the external evidence to be examined later, it would be virtually impossible to decide whether Lope took El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi from the original, or the expanded, account. However, assuming, for the moment, his dependence on Italian sources, it is fairly clear that the Bandello tale, rather than the variant Corona versions, provided the bulk of his material.

Both the Spanish play and the Bandello novella lay more emphasis than other Italian versions on the power of love to overcome social barriers. They concur with each other and differ from the other accounts by making the murderers offer a free pardon to the Duchess's servants (III.645-646), and by pointing up in the Ancona reunion the heroine's change of role, from gracious padrona to loving wife (III.89-90). They both include a scene in which each of the Duchess's servants gives his reasons for ~~abandoning~~ her (III.184-270), and in his dramatization of the courtship Lope allows



Camila to echo a remark which Bandello alone, among the Italian writers, gives to his Duchess:

Para tan poco entender  
muy descubierta me ofrezco.  
¿Dónde está tu ingenio Antonio?  
El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi, I.473-475.

Altrimenti trovandoti, sarei sforzata di pensare  
che in te non fosse quella perspicacità d'ingegno  
che da tutti è giudicato.

Bandello I.26, ed. A. Mondadori, vol. I, p. 323.

These parallels of detail would suggest that Lope probably did rely primarily on Bandello's account of the Amalfi story. However, some of the differences between the two works are also significant in this context.

As might be expected, of course, most of Lope's deviations from Bandello would seem to reflect a deliberate re-shaping, motivated simply by his own imaginative intentions. The chronological telescoping of the murders, for example, the addition of Urbino and Octavio, the omission of the lovers' expulsion from Ancona, and the inclusion of a fictitious rustic subplot, all correspond very evidently to artistic purpose or dramatic necessity. Similarly, Lope's exclusion of the murderous Cardinal as an active participant, and his transference of the tragic responsibility to the second brother - a somewhat shadowy figure in Bandello - may most sensibly be attributed to religious scruple and/or respect for the censor. Nevertheless, there are a few other points on which Lope disagrees with Bandello, but agrees with variant versions of the legend. For this reason we should consider seriously the possibility of the accounts recorded among the Corona manuscripts having provided the Spaniard with secondary source material.

#### The Corona Manuscripts

The collection of documents generally referred to as the Corona manuscripts are housed in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples. There are twenty-three of them; most of

them are anonymous and undated, and fifteen contain the Amalfi story, two of them presenting it in two slightly different forms. Morellini and Boklund have established that these accounts of real-life scandals among the Neapolitan nobility were first put together in the mid-sixteenth century by the brothers Silvio and Ascanio Corona, and that the collection was then augmented by later writers, who continued to borrow from each others' material, and from that of the Corona brothers, right into the eighteenth century. Despite his assertion that the versions of the Amalfi tale contained in this collection are not, in the main, varied or original enough to merit much attention, Boklund does single out one unique account: Filonico Alicarnasso's Vita della Principessa di Francavilla. My own impression, in fact, is that these accounts differ, from one another and from the original Bandello story, in more details of attitude and emphasis than Boklund allows. They appear to fall into three distinct categories, two of which reveal characteristics which make them potentially associable with Lope's play.

#### Group A

Filonico Alicarnasso, Vita della Principessa di Francavilla  
(MS.X.B.67), ff.7<sup>v</sup>-8<sup>v</sup>, f.239<sup>r</sup>.

Giovanni Antonio di Alessandro, La verità svelata, 1713  
(MS.X.C.21), part VI, pp.45 (an abbreviated copy of the above).

Boklund notes that Alicarnasso's account stands out from the others in three major respects: it states that the Duchess was poisoned (not strangled) in Ancona (rather than in Amalfi), it is unsympathetic towards the lovers, and it ends with the sceptical comment "istoria triviale e commune a tutti". To these observations we should add that it is possible that the two references to the Amalfi story in this manuscript may have been made by two different authors. The script on f.239<sup>r</sup> is different from that which characterizes the first, fuller version of the tale. Furthermore, while the shorter account is unsympathetic towards the lovers, the longer one portrays the Duchess



at least as an admirable character, and points up (as none of the other versions does) the injustice of the infanticides.

### Group B

La verità svelata (MS.I.D.72), vol.I, ff.77<sup>v</sup>-87<sup>v</sup>.

La verità svelata (MS.San Martino 64), ff.71<sup>r</sup>-79<sup>v</sup>.

Successi tragici et amorosi (MS.I.D.37), ff.43<sup>r</sup>-48<sup>r</sup>.

Successi diversi tragici et amorosi (MS.Brancacciano III.B.9), pp.80-91.

La verità svelata da Silvio Corona (MS.XV.F.47), pp.41-50.

Successi diversi tragici (MS.I.D.38), pp.40-47.

Casi tragici et amorosi (MS.X.C.15), ff.47<sup>r</sup>-53<sup>v</sup>.

Fatti occorsi in diversi tempi nella città di Napoli,  
1714 (MS.X.A.33), ff.42<sup>v</sup>-47<sup>r</sup>.

La verità svelata di Silvio et Ascanio Corona...abbreviata dal signor Dalconio Zellia, 1706 (MS.X.C.34), part I, ff.19<sup>v</sup>-23<sup>r</sup>.

This group is, for our purposes, the least interesting. The authors of these manuscripts differ from Bandello in giving extra details about the genealogy of the protagonists, in making it clear that the Cardinal is the more dangerous of the brothers, in eliminating the figure of Delio, and in stating that Antonio's eldest son escaped with his life. Also, they maintain an even greater neutrality towards the characters than Bandello does, and two of them (MS.XV.F.47 and MS.XC.34) allow the Duchess two faithful maids, while another (MS.San Martino 64) glosses over the element of cowardice usually hinted at in Antonio's first flight from danger. These details apart, however, the manuscripts in this section give an account of the tragedy which is substantially closer to Bandello's than those presented by the documents in groups A and C.

### Group C

Avvenimenti lussoriosi e tragici (MS.I.D.39), ff.66<sup>v</sup>-76<sup>r</sup>.

Giovanni Antonio di Alessandro, La verità svelata, 1713  
(MS.XC.21), part II, ff.60<sup>r</sup>-70<sup>v</sup>.

Aggiunta ai fatti tragici ed amorosi (MS.XC.32), vol.II, ff.2<sup>r</sup>-16<sup>v</sup>.

In addition to the deviations noted in the above section, these accounts vary the tale in several, more significant, ways: i) They criticize openly and severely the cruelty of the Duchess's brothers. ii) They portray the Duchess as a more feminine character than Bandello's heroine: where, for example, Bandello's Duchess has thought out her plans for remarriage coldly and clearly enough to give Antonio a concise review of her financial prospects, the protagonist of these accounts proposes to him "senza fare deliberatione del suo pensiero". iii) They are franker about Antonio's lack of moral fibre ("Si ridusse in casa del signore D. Visconte, dove quietamente dimorava... senza mai più pensare alla moglie e figli"). iv) They comment on the fact that the Duchess's maid deserved better than death for her loyalty. v) They make the observation that powerful men always have underlings to commit their crimes for them.

#### Lope and the Variant Prose Versions

It is clear that the manuscripts in group C are of special relevance to the question of Lope's sources. There is, in fact, an undated copy of MS.I.D.39 in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (MS.8248). Its provenance is unknown and its script would suggest a late seventeenth, or early eighteenth-century dating<sup>6</sup>. Nevertheless, its very existence supports the argument that the Amalfi legend may well have circulated in Spain in more than one version. Whether Lope was actually able to supplement Bandello's tale from other written accounts, or whether he acquired variant details from oral versions also to be recorded at a later date by authors contributing to the Corona collection, his play would seem to share enough of the distinguishing characteristics of the variant Italian versions for coincidence to be regarded as an inadequate explanation.

I have already noted that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is the only reworking of the Amalfi



tale to feature an (apparently) true-to-life portrayal of the young Duke's sympathy with his mother's second marriage. We might also bear in mind the fact that the Spaniard concurs with Alicarnasso in allowing the Duchess to die by poisoning, and in emphasizing the injustice of the infanticides. Most importantly, perhaps, a brief return to the third group of Corona manuscripts will remind us that Lope agrees with the authors of these documents in presenting the Duchess as more feminine, and Antonio as less masculine than Bandello does, in emphasizing much more the cruelty of the murderers, and in underlining scornfully the aristocratic habit of delegating dirty work:

Fu [realizzato] quella impresa di rara beltà...per mezzo di quali tiene sempre uno del governo...parmi i suoi serviggi.

Otavio Por seguros que vivan en Ancona,  
hay criados, pistolas y soldados,  
o yo le mataré por mi persona.

Julio Para eso, Otavio, sobrarán criados.

El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi, III.345-348.

The Amalfi legend appears to have provoked a wide variety of responses in Italy between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. This alone leads one to suspect that it would have been the centre of much lively discussion. Given, then, the close links between Naples and the Spanish court during our period, Lope's absorption - conscious or otherwise - of variations on the story was almost to be expected. I would suggest that he probably adopted details from current versions, and grafted them onto the Bandello tale which furnished him with the primary source for his play.

#### Lope, Giraldis and Cervantes

It is difficult either to challenge or to support the argument that Lope based one of the key events in his play on the initial "baby" episode of (?) Cervantes's La señora Cornelia. In both cases a new-born child is handed over, under cover of darkness, to a man who is

mistakenly assumed to be the father. In both cases, the result is a network of intrigue and, as far as I know, the incident is not traceable to any current topic or literary precedent. Lope might well have taken it from a manuscript version of Cervantes's work. He might equally well have thought it up for himself.

The other theory about the minor sources of our play seems less plausible. It is true that Giraldi's novella II.6 concerns a mésalliance destroyed by the honour-obsessed relatives of the wife, and that the trickery and gory details of its denouement find parallels in Lope's play, which correspond with nothing in the prose versions of the Amalfi legend. However, as I shall have occasion to repeat elsewhere, the unequal marriage was a very common topic in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Similarly, the treacherous death trap and the final display of severed heads were standard features of a Senecan tradition upon which Lope and Giraldi are most likely to have drawn independently. Considering, furthermore, that magnificent stoicism sets the tone of Giraldi's tragic finale, and pathetic helplessness that of Lope's, a close relationship between the two denouements is, at best, improbable.

#### Lope's Purposes

A full evaluation of Lope's artistry would be out of place in this section. The point which requires most elaboration here is that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is a play with a social purpose. It portrays more pointedly than any other version of the legend, the intense and enduring love which provides a "natural" justification for a socially unorthodox mésalliance. It includes a fictitious sub-plot which shows the superiority of rustic common-sense to aristocratic butchery, in affairs of honour (I.975-1153), and it makes merciless villains of the men who oppose the match on the grounds of social impropriety (eg. II.570-652). It also, as I noted earlier, combines tragic pathos with social protest by allowing Amalfi's final vow of vengeance to suggest that violence begets violence.

The victims of the catastrophe are portrayed as largely admirable, and almost wholly innocent. Antonio is undeniably weaker than his wife, refusing to take the masculine lead which she repeatedly offers him (eg. I.865-



896), and finally abandoning her in the face of danger (III.508-552). It is, however, a tribute to Lope's characterization that while Antonio's cowardice contributes to the tragic build-up, he never loses our sympathy. His capacity for tenderness (eg. II.170-210) saves him from feeble mediocrity, just as touches of pathos in the portrayal of the Duchess (eg. 981-988) balance out her masterful determination.

In point of fact, El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is one of the many plays which belie the argument that Lope was a careless artist, more concerned with ingenuity of plot than with detail or convincing characterization. It is appropriate, for example, that a play which concerns itself with the social position of the underling should be remarkably thoughtful in its presentation of even minor servant-figures. Furio, Celso, Dinarco and Filelfo all display consistent and individual characteristics throughout, Filelfo, for example, being the servant who sympathizes with Antonio's dismissal in Act II (877-880) and also the character who encourages young Amalfi's mercy at a later stage in the play (III.409).

On a rather different tack, it is a subtle interweaving of the many associations of sol and luna which gives to Antonio's "father" speech (II.168-210) its arresting quality, and the cosmic undertones of this tragedy of social injustice come through almost solely on the strength of well-placed details. The reported death of Bartola's baby (I.563-573), for instance, reinforces the underlying sense of providential disorder, and the notions of relative innocence and original sin inevitably brought to mind by the final infanticides are foreshadowed by the Duchess's speech on woman, birth and human error (II.721-734). All in all, therefore, it is clear that while El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi may lack the ambivalence and complexities of Lope's greatest plays, it reveals enough careful artistry and imaginative development of character and concept to justify detailed study.

Footnotes to Chapter I

1. Adolf Friedrich von Schack, Geschichte der Dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien (Frankfurt-on-Main, 1854) 3 vols, trans. E. de Mier, Historia de la literatura y arte dramático en España (Madrid, 1885-1887), 5 vols, III, 95-96. Karl Kiesow, "Die Verschiedenen Bearbeitungen der Novelle von der Herzogin von Amalfi des Bandello in den Literaturen des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts", Anglia, 17 (1895), 199-258. Domenico Morellini, Giovanna d'Aragona, Duchessa d'Amalfi: spigolature storiche e letterarie (a proposito d'una novella di Matteo Bandello) (Cesena, 1906). Antonio Gasparetti, "Giovanni Battista Giraldis e Lope de Vega", Bulletin Hispanique, 32 (1930), 372-403. F. L. Lucas, The Complete Works of John Webster (London, 1927), II. John E. Houseman, Parallel Plots in English and Spanish Drama of the Early Seventeenth Century, unpublished thesis (University of London, 1951). Gunnar Boklund, The Duchess of Malfi: Sources, Themes, Characters (Massachusetts, 1962).
2. In addition to the scholars mentioned above, see Matteo Camera, Memorie storico-diplomatiche dell'antica città e ducato di Amalfi (Salerno, 1876-1881), II, 78-82.
3. These facts are apparent from the family tree set out by Matteo Camera, II, 127-128. Alfonso Piccolomini II named his second son Antonio and his third Giovanni; his eldest daughter, Beatrice, would seem to have been called after the faithful maid who died with the Duchess.
4. The play in question is La contienda de Diego García de Paredes y el Capitán Juan de Urbina, Ac. XI.
5. Morellini's theory that the Delio who witnesses Antonio's murder in Bandello's version, represents the author himself, is convincing, but in the last analysis unprovable.
6. Also suggestive of this dating is the watermark on the manuscript. It bears a strong resemblance to two Madrilenian watermarks reproduced by F. del Mármol, and dated 1691 and 1697 (Dictionnaire des filigranes, Dinant, 1900, p. 93 and 96).



7. See Antonio Restori, Una collezione di commedie di Lope de Vega (Livorno, 1891), 6 and 27.

## Chapter II

### Lope Plays Based on Bandello Stories

I have already mentioned that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi numbers among those Lope plays which have their primary roots in Matteo de Bandello's collection of short stories (Le novelle, 1554, ed. Francesco Flora, Verona, 1934). Despite the fact that hispanists have worked quite extensively on Lope's borrowings from other novellieri like Giraldis and Boccaccio, little research has been done on his adaptations of Bandello tales.<sup>1</sup> For this reason it seems appropriate to tackle the topic on a fairly broad basis here, with a particular view to answering the following questions: i) Which of the Lope plays known to us are based - in part at least - on Bandello stories? ii) Was Lope more indebted to the original Italian Bandello, or to the Spanish translation of the French version, in his accumulation of potential dramatic material? iii) What can we learn from these Bandello-based plays about Lope's approach to his sources: his methods of selection, his techniques of dramatic adaptation, the extent of his artistic elaboration?

### Critical Work to Date

With regard to the first question, the most valuable groundwork has been carried out by Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (Orígenes de la novela, Edición Nacional de las Obras Completas, vols 13-16, Santander, 1943, 15, 34-35), Eugène Kohler ("Lope et Bandello", Hommage à Ernest Martinenche: Études hispaniques et américaines, Paris, 1939, 116-142), and Antonio Gasparetti (Las novelas de Bandello como fuentes del teatro de Lope, Salamanca, 1939). Between them these scholars have established that Lope based the following plays on Bandello novels:

Castelvines y Monteses (1606-12; Ac. XV). Bandello, II.9.  
El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi. Bandello, I.6.  
 (1599-1603; Ac. XV).



Los bandos de Sena (1597-1603;Ac.N.III). Bandello,I.49.  
Carlos el perseguido (before 1596;Ac.XV). Bandello,IV.5.  
El desdén vengado (1617;Ac.XV). Bandello,III.17.  
La mayor victoria (1615-24;Ac.XV). Bandello,I.18.  
La quinta de Florencia (1598-1603;Ac.XV). Bandello,II.15.  
El padrino desposado (1598-1600;Ac.N.VIII). Bandello,III.54.  
El castigo sin venganza (1631;Ac.XV). Bandello,I.44.  
El castigo del discreto (1606-08;Ac.N.IV). Bandello,I.35.(The source of this play was first discovered by William L. Fichter,ed.,El castigo del discreto,New York,1925).

Kohler,Gasparetti and Menéndez y Pelayo have also pointed out that three of Lope's other plays derive partially from Bandello stories:La viuda valenciana (1595-1603;Ac.XV) draws on Bandello IV.26,as well as on the well-known myth of Psyche.<sup>2</sup> El genovés liberal (1599-1608;Ac.N.VI) is taken partly from Bandello II.26,and partly from Juan Bautista de Udine's Lacrimosa istoria di due amanti,and La Reina Doña María (play of doubtful authenticity,1604-08;Ac.VIII) owes its plot to a fusion of Bandello II.43 and the chronicle sources documented by Menéndez y Pelayo.<sup>3</sup> In addition to these definite links between Bandello's collection of novels and Lope's theatre,there have been a few,more tentative,suggestions which need to be discussed here.Gasparetti has noted that La esclava de su galán (1625-30;Ac.N.XII) shares various features with Bandello II.36,and that ¡Si no vieran las mujeres! (1631-32;Ac.XV) appears to be a later reworking of the Bandello substance contained in La mayor victoria. Menéndez y Pelayo has suggested that Bandello I.45, II.6 and II.7 might all be considered as possible sources for El perro del hortelano (1613-15;Ac.N.XIII),and that one of Bandello's stories - he does not specify which - may have provided a basis for El villano en su rincón (1611;Ac.XV).Lastly,Kohler has argued that two of the Lope plays usually regarded as reworkings of popular traditions,may have been taken specifically from Bandello tales: La difunta pleitada (1593-1603;Ac.N.IV:Bandello II.41),and La guante de Doña Blanca (1627-35,Ac.IX:Bandello III.39).



Plays of Suggested Bandello Origin

The Unlikely Cases: La esclava de su galán and  
El perro del hortelano

There are two important factors to be borne in mind when the assignation of a certain Lope play to a specific Bandello source is at stake. Firstly, Bandello was the kind of writer who picked on the most popular topics of his age, borrowing freely from oral tradition, and from other writers; secondly, Lope himself read widely, doubtless absorbing variants on current themes from all kinds of sources, including Bandello tales which he may never have intended to use directly as dramatic material. It is therefore necessary to distinguish carefully between those Bandello stories which have so many parallels of plot, theme and characterization with the Lope plays which resemble them, that they stand out unmistakably as "sources", and those novels which seem to be linked with certain plays merely by virtue of a shared topic or feature. General parallels of the latter kind may indicate little more than an interest, common to the two authors, in the popular trends and issues of the day.

It seems to me, in fact, that such similarities in the cultural and ideological backgrounds of Lope and Bandello probably account for the parallels between both El perro del hortelano and La esclava de su galán and the Italian novels upon which they are sometimes supposed to have been based. It is true that the former play involves a pair of unequal lovers (like Bandello, I.45), a dominant woman (like Bandello, II.7), and a long-lost noble motif (like Bandello, II.6). Similarly, the latter does coincide with the novel from which it was allegedly taken, in elaborating on the idea of a girl winning her lover by going to serve him in disguise. However, I have argued elsewhere that the notions of feminine servility, masculine dominance, "hidden" breeding and unequal marriage all constituted standard topics from the middle of the fifteenth century onwards, and in these cases there is little evidence to suggest special links between novels and plays. La esclava de su galán lacks the two features most basic to Bandello II.36: the heroine's transvestite activities, and the confusing appearance of her twin brother. Again, the basic plots of



El perro del hortelano, Bandello II.6 and Bandello II.7 are - despite their individual parallels of theme - completely dissimilar from each other, and although the situation outlined in Bandello I.45 is more akin to that of the Lope play, the denouements and characterization of these two servant/mistress works are substantially different.

I am unable to suggest an alternative source for La esclava de su galán, and would, in any case, argue that its combination of stock theatrical figures, topical themes and standard plot devices, makes it unnecessary for any one origin to be assigned to it.<sup>4</sup> However, if El perro del hortelano must be linked with a single literary precedent, it appears to have much more in common with one of the Boccaccio possibilities also noted by Menéndez y Pelayo: Il Decamerone (1471, ed. Vittore Branca, Tutte le opere, Verona, 1974, IV) II.7. In this story, as in Lope's play, the protagonist is called "Teodoro", the unequal lovers are depicted as selfish and cowardly, and a happy ending is achieved by an application of the "long-lost noble" idea. It seems to me that these are the kind of similarities between plays and novels which allow us to talk of "sources" rather than of "common themes" or "topical parallels".

#### Literary Sources and Folkloric Origins:

#### La guante de Doña Blanca and La difunta pleitada

It becomes more difficult to decide how much a Lope work owes to its Bandello precedent when both novel and play are known to be, not just variants on a common theme, but actual reworkings of a long-standing tradition or popular legend. For example, there is a strong possibility that Bandello may have taken his novel III.39 from one of the several Spanish romances or anecdotes which recounted the traditional story of the gallant lover and the glove among the lions.<sup>5</sup> This possibility automatically throws doubt on the theory that Lope used Bandello's story as a source for La guante de Doña Blanca, because it suggests that similarities between the Spanish play and the Italian tale may be attributable less to Lope's acquaintance with Bandello, than to a detailed knowledge of Spanish folklore common to both authors. Similarly,

Bandello's novel II.41 is very similar to, for example, Luis de Zápata's version of the "buried bride" legend (Varia historia, 1549?, ed. G.C. Horseman, 59-61). One cannot, therefore, be certain that Lope relied on the Italian rather than the Spanish account of the story, in his writing of La difunta pleitada.<sup>6</sup>

In both cases, the issues are confused still further by the fact that Lope deviates substantially from all known versions of the legends concerned. In La difunta pleitada, for example, he changes the verdict given, by both Bandello and popular tradition, to the lawsuit following the bride's revival. Again, La guante de Doña Blanca takes so little from the associated legend that it omits several of the features most central to all other accounts of the tale: notably the bofetón with which the gallant hero punishes his selfish lady. It is possible that, in re-working the "glove" legend, Lope may have taken the name of Blanca's rival, Leonor, from the heroine of Bandello's version,<sup>7</sup> and that the disillusionment theme of La difunta pleitada may suggest a general link with Bandello's work, since Lope himself associated the Italian novelle with the concept of desengaño.<sup>8</sup> However, such parallels are too speculative to provide solid evidence for the argument that La guante de Doña Blanca and La difunta pleitada derive specifically from Bandello's accounts of the same legends. In fact, the traditional tales of the "glove" and the "buried bride" had probably formed a part of Lope's cultural heritage long before Bandello's collection found its way to his desk. It is therefore unlikely that a reading of these stories in their Italian versions would have done anything more than refresh his memory, and furnish him with a few - mainly insignificant - variants on legends which he knew to be essentially Spanish.

The Most Acceptable Suggestions:

¡Si no vieran las mujeres! and El villano en  
su rincón

It is no coincidence that the most feasible of the suggested but unproven links between Lope and Bandello involve two plays which the Spaniard wrote relatively



late in life. I would argue that El villano en su rincón (1611) and ¡Si no vieran las mujeres! (1631-32) are both related, in some sense, to Bandello's work, because they both seem to constitute later reworkings of plays which Lope did originally derive from the Italian collection. The difficulty lies in deciding whether, in these second-hand borrowings from Bandello, Lope relied more on the novelle concerned, than on his own first adaptations of them. It is obviously easier to support the notion that Lope drew directly from Bandello I.18 in writing both ¡Si no vieran las mujeres! and the earlier La mayor victoria (1615-24), than it is to apply a parallel argument to the three-way relationship between Bandello II.15, La quinta de Florencia and El villano en su rincón.

The basic plots of ¡Si no vieran las mujeres! and La mayor victoria are so similar, to each other and to the Italian novel, that Lope must surely have had the essentials of the latter to the front of his mind when writing both plays. In all three versions a ruler forces himself to rise above his lascivious passion for a chaste girl of lowly origin. Furthermore, although Lope adhered more closely to the names, characterization and moralistic theme of the Italian account in La mayor victoria than he did subsequently, it seems likely that the complex interplay of ver/creer, sexual/spiritual antitheses which he added to the later reworking, derives directly from minor features of the Italian tale, which do not figure in La mayor victoria: "Come l'imperatore la vide, meravigliosamente si diletto della vista di lei, la quale gli piacque, che mentre ch'egli stette in chiesa sempre le tenne gli occhi fisamente nel bel viso" (Bandello, I.18, ed., F. Flora, I.216).

It would appear that El villano en su rincón is similarly, although more indirectly, related to Bandello II.15, through La quinta de Florencia. However, it is necessary to justify, as a preliminary to this argument, the theory that Menéndez y Pelayo was thinking of the striking parallels between these two plays, when he suggested that El villano en su rincón had its roots somewhere in Bandello's collection. His proposition has not met with great enthusiasm to date.<sup>9</sup> However, even though the main plots of these two plays are dissimilar,



it is not difficult to see how their close affinities of theme and characterization might prompt the conclusion that both owed something to the Bandello novel in question. Both works revolve around the moral and social problems inherent in the concept of "everyman's dignity", and both feature a juxtaposition of wise king and proud peasant, which culminates in a meal, served up with reminders of the complex nature of kingship.<sup>10</sup> All of these elements, except the consideration of the King's social role, figure in Bandello. Furthermore, the Italian story - which tells how a ruler forces his favourite courtier to marry the peasant girl he has raped - does bear some resemblance to the amorous subplot of El villano en su rincón.

Of course, since the appearance of Marcel Bataillon's enlightening study, it has become all but impossible to deny that the basic plot of this peasant play is folkloric and proverbial in origin. Nevertheless, there are grounds for supposing that, even if Lope did not work directly from Bandello in this case, he may well have borrowed some of the thematic elements of El villano en su rincón from his own, Bandello-based La quinta de Florencia. Certainly, the artistic ambiguities surrounding Juan Labrador, his perverted sense of dignity, and his developing relationship with the King, suggest a more complex reworking of those social and moral issues which underlie both the earlier play and the Bandello novel.

This brings me back to the point that words like "source" and "borrowing" are sometimes too specific to be used in a definition of the relationship between a Bandello novella and a Lope play. In cases where two plays appear to derive from one story - as in cases where a novel and a play are linked by a similar interpretation of a traditional legend, or a shared interest in a common theme - it is often more accurate to talk in terms of "parallels", "variants on a popular topic" or, occasionally "second-hand adaptations". Inevitably, this guarded approach to the problem of literary sources encourages a rather negative conclusion insofar as the suggested but unproven links between Lope and Bandello are concerned. It appears that three of the plays in question

- El villano en su rincón, La guante de Doña Blanca and La difunta pleitada - might possibly have been based, indirectly or in part, on the Italian collection. However, I would argue that ¡Si no vieran las mujeres! is the only play of "uncertain" Bandello origin which shows clear signs of having derived, directly and substantially, from its Italian precedent.

#### The Italian Bandello or the French Translation?

Lope once referred to Bandello, using the title which had been given to his work by contemporary French translators, and alluding briefly to the existence of Spanish translations of Italian novelle: "También hay libros de novelas, de ellas traducidas de italianos... confieso que son libros de gran entretenimiento, y que podían ser ejemplares, como algunas de las historias trágicas del Bandelo" (Las fortunas de Diana, ed. F. Rico, Novelas a Marcia Leonarda, Madrid, 1968, 28). This famous passage has raised the question of whether Lope was more indebted, in his borrowings, to the original Italian Bandello, or to some version of the French translation produced by Pierre Boisteau and François Belleforest (Histoires tragiques... mises en notre langue française, 1556-1582). Boisteau and Belleforest translated seventy-three of the two-hundred-and-eight Bandello stories, changing some of them in outline and detail, and adding to almost all, long passages of description and, homily.<sup>11</sup> The part of their collection which concerns us was published in 1558 by Belleforest alone, and the theory that Lope availed himself mainly of this elaborated version rests on just one fact: while there was - as far as we know - no contemporary Spanish translation of the Italian Bandello, several of these early Belleforest adaptations were rendered (fairly faithfully) into Spanish, and circulated in Spain in at least three editions: Historias trágicas ejemplares, Salamanca, 1589; Madrid, 1596; Valladolid, 1603.



### The Conflicting Critical Arguments

Menéndez y Pelayo remained impartial in his dealings with the Lope/Bandello/Belleforest question; he simply noted that the dramatist almost certainly had a good working knowledge of Italian, but that there were Spanish translations of the French Bandello available from the end of the sixteenth century. On the other hand, Gasparetti works from the unstated assumption that any plots which Lope borrowed from Bandello would have been derived directly from the Italian version. Kohler takes a tentative stand against this supposition, putting forward the hypothesis that, since the Spanish translation contains fourteen of the Belleforest stories, and since Lope based (by his reckoning) thirteen plays on Bandello novelle, it is quite likely that the Spanish collection provided Lope with all, or most, of his Bandello source material.

### A Possible Combination of Spanish and Italian Sources

Kohler's argument - formulated at a time when none of the Spanish translations of Belleforest was available for inspection - has to contend with one major objection. The two accessible editions of the Spanish collection appear to contain only four of the Bandello stories reworked by Lope: those which form the bases of El castigo sin venganza, La quinta de Florencia, El desdén vengado and Castelvines y Monteses.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, the theory that Lope took the majority of his Bandello-based plays from the Belleforest adaptations loses considerable viability, unless it can be shown, either that the second - unobtainable - edition of the Spanish translation may have differed greatly from the other two, or that Lope could have read Belleforest in the original French. Neither of these potential arguments is very plausible. There is nothing to suggest that the French Belleforest crossed the Pyrenees during Lope's lifetime, and the licencia which prefaces the 1603

edition of the Spanish version implies that all contemporary editions of the translation were basically the same: "Puédese imprimir y vender un libro que ante los dichos señores presento, que otras veces con su licencia ha sido impreso, intitulado Historias trágicas". This combination of factors suggests to me that while Lope probably did take the four plays mentioned above from the Spanish translation of the French version, he is more likely to have derived the remainder of his Bandello-based works from some edition of the Italian original.<sup>13</sup> Such an impression seems to be confirmed, to a significant extent, by the internal evidence which emerges from a three-way comparison between some of the relevant plays, and the associated novelle as they figure in the Italian Bandello, and the French and/or Spanish translations.

### The Internal Evidence

Three of the four plays which could have originated from the Spanish translation of Belleforest show, in fact, clear signs of having done so. The same kinds of similarity do not, however, emerge when the other Bandello-based plays are set side by side with their counterparts in the French collection. It is true that one or two of the plays which cannot have derived from the known Spanish translation - notably Los bandos de Sena and Carlos el perseguido - share with the equivalent French tales minor features which are absent from the Italian originals. Here again, however, apparent affinities can probably be attributed to common factors in the cultural and literary backgrounds of Frenchman and Spaniard. For example, both Lope and Belleforest associate the protagonist of Los bandos de Sena with the figure of Pompey (a standard personification of courage for the sixteenth century). They again coincide in adding to the Italian basis of Carlos el perseguido a stock literary burla, when they make the villainess attempt a seduction under colour of testing a servant's loyalty to his master. To explain away in this manner apparent links



of detail between Lope and the French Bandello may seem unduly dismissive. However, the outstandingly clear similarities which La quinta de Florencia, El castigo sin venganza and El desdén vengado bear to the equivalent Spanish novels, strengthen my conviction that where Lope used the elaborated, as opposed to the original, Bandello, there are usually more than minor details to point up his source.

It is very evident, for example, that the characterization and moral implications of El castigo sin venganza are more akin to those of the associated Belleforest novel (in both French and Spanish editions), than to those which Bandello worked into his original version of the story. The Italian maintains an attitude of detached disapproval towards all three of his protagonists, portraying the Marchioness particularly as a ruthless seductress. The French novelist, on the contrary, reworks the story to show the Marquis as a man broken by his son's death, and to emphasize the point that the lovers, too, are tragic victims: "La virtud [de los amantes] fuera de esta falta, no podía fácilmente ser comparada" (f. 319<sup>v</sup>). Lope's tragedy of diffused responsibility and torn sympathies would seem to owe much more to this pathetic, French interpretation of the tale, than to the moralistic Italian account, and El desdén vengado and La quinta de Florencia reveal with even greater clarity a bias towards the elaborated versions of the equivalent novelle.<sup>14</sup>

Firstly, the ending of El desdén vengado corresponds only with that of the associated story in the Spanish collection. In this case the Spanish translator must have included the final liaison between the heroine and her silent lover among those solturas which - as he says in the introduction - needed to be eliminated from the French version. Certainly, he saw fit to depart here from his usual criterion of faithful translation, differing from both the Italian and the French Bandello, but coinciding with Lope, in his depiction of the heroine as ultimately deprived of both lover and money. A second pointer to the probability of Lope's having used the Spanish version of this story

is to be found in his portrayal of the heroine herself. He is far less likely to have derived his deceitful and hard-hearted Celia from Bandello's silly but inoffensive protagonist, than from the hypocritical m\~nx which she becomes in the French and Spanish versions. Thirdly, the climax of this tale - the point at which Celia makes Filiberto promise to remain mute for two years - is dramatized by Lope to include a feature which corresponds closely with one of the Belleforest additions to the original novella. Just as the dramatist's hero insists on miming his acquiescence to Celia's command, the Spanish version states: "Dióle a entender por señas que obedecía y que haría su mandado" (f.394<sup>v</sup>).

Lastly, La quinta de Florencia features a continual interplay of "hunting" and "nature/art" imagery which must surely be rooted in some of the descriptive and allegorical elaboration with which the French novelist "embellished" the original Bandello story:

He sabido que cerca de aquí anda un puerco  
jabalí de los mayores que se han visto, y  
iremos a despertarle de su sueño y reposo.  
(Historias trágicas, ff.338r-338v).

Háme dicho aquel viejo que en su tierra  
anda un gran jabalí que le destruye  
su hacienda...  
¡Así César traidor! Agora entiendo  
la causa deste mal.  
(La quinta de Florencia, Ac.XV., 374b).

Vieron una fuente hecha en un mármol...  
demás del artificio y trabajo ordinario del  
jardinero...había naturaleza producido  
cuatro fuentes a los cuatro cantones.  
(Historias trágicas, ff.339v-340r).

Labré una hermosa quinta...  
Puse en ella dos jardines  
que a Babilonia pudieran  
dar envidia en artificio,  
árboles y flores bellas.  
Puse cuatro fuentes  
con mil copas de Amaltea.  
(La quinta de Florencia, Ac.XV., 365a).



### Bandello Versus Belleforest: the Conclusions

There is, then, little doubt in my mind that those Lope plays which match up with stories in the Spanish translation of Belleforest, did derive from that particular collection. However, we lack solid evidence to suggest a link between the remaining Bandello-based plays and their equivalents in the French Belleforest. Furthermore, as Kohler has already pointed out, one of these other plays - El padrino desposado - appears to have been drawn from a story which was never reworked by either Belleforest or his later collaborator, Boisteau. Taken together, these facts point to the conclusion that Lope knew the work of the French translators only through the small collection of Belleforest tales actually rendered into Spanish, and that those of his Bandello-based plays which did not derive from this collection were almost certainly taken from the Italian text itself.

### The Reworking of the Sources

It is all too tempting to restrict analyses of Lope's use of his sources to brief comments about whether or not he adheres closely to the events outlined by the relevant chronicle, romance, novel or whatever. It seems to me that there are three reasons for avoiding this approach insofar as the dramatist's reworking of Bandello tales is concerned. Firstly, an examination of the techniques which Lope uses to turn relatively simple tales into complex works of art is, in one sense, the only justification for academic argument about sources, variants and editions. Secondly, it is impossible to make general rules about the extent to which Lope deviates from his Bandello sources. In some plays - Castelvines y Monteses and Los bandos de Sena, for example - he prunes the novelistic bases ruthlessly, and changes plot, theme and characterization to fit his own artistic purposes. In others - notably La mayor victoria and El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi - he retains the basic outlines of the Bandello

accounts, perhaps because they already contain substantial dramatic and thematic potential. Thirdly, attention to the kind, as well as to the number, of alterations which Lope makes in adapting some of these novelle, may help to highlight certain facets of his dramatic craftsmanship which are still overlooked at times.

### The Choice of Material and the Desengaño Theme

The question of how Lope reworked his Bandello sources is, of course, closely tied up with the problem of how he selected them. Considerations of dramatic potential and topical interest taken for granted and left aside for the moment, it seems that a surprisingly concrete factor may also have helped to determine those tales which Lope was to re-shape for the stage. The dramatist himself linked the Italian novella with the concept of desengaño in an educative sense: "Habían de escribir [los cuentos] hombres científicos... gente que halla en los desengaños notables sentencias y aforismos" (Las fortunas de Diana, ed. F. Rico, Novelas a Marcia Leonarda, Madrid, 1968, 28). Despite the many nuances of the word desengaño, I would argue that it is used here in a very basic sense, to suggest that the novella specializes in treating the theme of human disillusionment, and in teaching a philosophy of life-induced pessimism.<sup>15</sup> Certainly, such an interpretation of Lope's comments on the novellieri might help to explain why he seems to have been drawn so often to Bandello tales which could be reworked to imply a semi-sceptical, or at least, a disenchanted, view of life.

In El genovés liberal, for example, Lope takes up Bandello's exploration of the human capacity for self-control, and translates it into political as well as personal terms. The edge of irony already evident in the prose version is sharpened to a sceptical point by the play, which finally suggests that, while the world may well reward irresponsible self-indulgence in the individual, it will not hesitate to condemn unjustly the most Utopian of social autonomies, and the most public-



spirited of rebels:

Paulo      Era un pobre tintero,  
               vinieron de mano armada,  
               no pude a la furia airada  
               resistir de un vulgo fiero...  
 Rey        Tiempo has tenido, amigo,  
               de reparar la violencia.  
               A Paulo y a los demás  
               cortad luego las cabezas.  
               (El genovés liberal, Ac.N.VI., 140b).

El padrino desposado and El desdén vengado are similarly revealing of this bias towards disillusionment and pessimism. Bandello's story of the royal padrino who steals the bride is reworked in Lope's version to illustrate the notion that nature does not necessarily ordain that amor con amor se pague, and that disappointed losers in the love-and-marriage game are therefore inevitable. More significant, perhaps, is the fact that in the denouement of El desdén vengado, Lope gives substance and prominence to Belleforest's implication that materialism can be ultimately lethal to the emotional and spiritual capacities of an individual:

Quiero que rompa el silencio,  
 y con los diez mil ducados  
 y los otros diez que tengo  
 casar con igual mío,  
 porque lo demás es viento.  
 (El desdén vengado, Ac.XV., 434b).

Finally, even Castelvines y Monteses - usually described as a purely comic variant on the Romeo and Juliet legend - borrows from the prose version themes of mistrust and broken faith, and a mood of uneasy bewilderment. A sense of chaos and cosmic disillusionment filters through the farce even during the last scenes:

...todo el mundo  
 anda al revés: los mozos a la tierra,  
 y los viejos al tálamo.  
 (Castelvines y Monteses, Ac.XV., 353a).

An examination of other plays - Carlos el perseguido, for instance, El castigo del discreto or La difunta pleitada - would be appropriate in this context. However,

enough has been said to indicate the significance of the apparent link in Lope's mind between the work of the novellieri and the disenchanted view of life. Most of the plays at hand do not lay a predominantly tragic interpretation on the Historias trágicas from which they derive. Nevertheless, they tend, as a group, to emphasize the limitations of man, and the instability - both cosmic and social - of his world. It could therefore be argued that one of the artistic purposes which influenced Lope in both his choosing and reworking of Bandello stories, was the wish to adjust to his own tragi-comic canons, life-based tales which were potentially provocative of a mood of disillusionment.

#### Novelistic Potential and Dramatic Elaboration

To pass from the general to the detailed aspect of Lope's dramatization of Bandello, the most fundamental point is that the plays have, on the whole, greater complexity of theme and characterization than the tales upon which they are based. In several cases, Lope appears to have provided for his versions some major source of thematic ambivalence or artistic tension, simply by elaborating ingeniously on details which are circumstantial or insignificant in the original accounts. I have already mentioned, for example, that the physical/spiritual conflicts and sensory motifs of ¡Si no vieran las mujeres! probably reflect a highly imaginative interpretation of Bandello's moralistic warnings against the contemplation of feminine beauty during mass. In the same kind of way, El padrino desposado seems to have derived both its subplot and its undertones of Christian-Moorish discord from one short sentence in the Italian account: "E contra questo povero Conte...vorrò io incrudelire e levargli la moglie...Diventerò io peggio che i mori di Granata, i quali sono certissimo che simile sceleratezza non commetterebbero?" (Bandello, III.54, 526). It would, however, be unfair to imply that all of the Bandello novels taken up by Lope were merely crude outlines of events which needed to be infused with



artistic substance, before a suggestive, complex dramatization could emerge. Bandello and Belleforest were creative writers too, and it is clear that in some of their stories Lope found the kind of imaginative artistry which could provide the foundations for his own subtle interweaving of ideas, imagery and characterization.

It has already been noted, for instance, that the "hunting" and "nature/art" allegories which run through La quinta de Florencia, interlocking with the events actually taking place on stage, and pointing up the central issues of the play, were already present, in embryo, in the French account, and that the protagonists of El castigo sin venganza owe some of their complexities and ambivalence to the characterization of the Belleforest story. Much the same should be said of the "generosity" theme as it figures in El desdén vengado. Interpreted by Lope as a neoplatonism/materialism conflict, and illustrated in his play by a barrage of puns on the word dar, its essence is traceable to the skilfully-implied contrast between the noble king and the mean heroine in the French version. Even in cases where Lope drew his material from the shorter, Italian accounts, it is sometimes evident that his exposition of themes and issues was inspired, in part, by artistically effective features of the original. The novelistic source of La viuda valenciana, for example, portrays the incontinent heroine with mischievous ambiguity. Ironic observations about her "daylight chastity" find an obvious reflection in the light/darkness, deceit/truth antitheses of Lope's play. They also seem to lie behind the two-tiered denouement of the Spanish work, which shows how the heroine is - literally and metaphorically - enlightened when she is finally forced to expose herself to the reality of her own emotions:

Descubre la luz...

¿Hay tal fuerza? ¿Hay tal maldad?  
Señor, esto es hecho ya...  
Quiéreme bien, y también  
yo a él por el mismo estilo.  
Si fuere voluntad tuya,  
yo quiero ser su mujer.

(La viuda valenciana, Ac.XV., 528b).

General Conclusion

I have said before that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is a thoughtful and thought-provoking adaptation of a Bandello novella. I would now add that these qualities make it typical of Lope's Bandello-based works. Some of the plays at hand follow their novelistic sources closely; others deviate substantially from the original tales, occasionally incorporating material from other sources. Some - although not all - appear to interpret the novel as an art form which emphasizes the disenchanted view of life, and a few seem to differ from the majority in drawing on the French, rather than on the Italian, Bandello. All, however, bear testimony to the care with which Lope scanned even the smallest details of a novel, the imaginative sensitivity which he applied in picking out and building upon features of effective artistry already present in the originals, and the complex craftsmanship with which he dramatized subtly and ideatively the crudest and least substantial of stories.



Footnotes to Chapter II

1. For helpful information on Lope's debts to Boccaccio and Giraldi see Caroline B. Bourland, The Short Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century (Massachusetts, 1927); Arturo Farinelli, Italia e Spagna (Torino, 1929); Ezio Levi, Lope de Vega e l'Italia (Florence, 1935); Antonio Gasparetti, "Giovan Battista Giraldi e Lope de Vega", Bulletin Hispanique, XXXII (1930), 372-403.
2. For a thorough exploration of the relationship between this myth and La viuda valenciana, see J.L. Aguirre's edition of the latter (Madrid, 1967).
3. All the relevant versions of this legend are collected together in Ac.VIII, cxxx-cxlvii.
4. Other examples of Lope heroines who go to serve their lovers, in disguise, are to be found in La serrana de Tormes (1590-1595, Ac.N.IX), La inocente Laura (1604-08, Ac.N.XII), and El mármol de Felisardo (1594-98, Ac.XIV). It should be noted, however, that in such cases the heroine's disguise is usually transvestite.
5. See Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (Ac.IX, lxxxv-xcii), and José de Perott, "La guante de la dama", Revista de Filología Española, VI (1919), 63-64. These scholars show that the "glove" legend was popular in Spain from about the end of the fifteenth century.
6. Sixteenth-century Spanish manifestations of the "buried bride" tradition have been thoroughly documented by María Goyri de Menéndez Pidal, La difunta pleitada: estudio de literatura comparativa (Madrid, 1909).
7. A.H. Krappe ("The Legend of the Glove", Modern Language Notes, XXXIV (1919), 16-23) points out that Bandello's rendering of the legend was the first in which the

- heroine's name was changed from Ana de Mendoza to Leonora.
8. See Las fortunas de Diana, ed. F. Rico, Novelas a Marcia Leonarda (Madrid, 1968), 28. This is an aspect of Lope's approach to his Bandello sources which will be explored in more detail later.
  9. It is dismissed out of hand by Marcel Bataillon ("El villano en su rincón", Bulletin Hispanique, LI (1949), 5-38), and Joaquín de Entrambasaguas (Lope de Vega y su tiempo, Barcelona, 1961, 2 vols). Kohler suggests that Menéndez y Pelayo may have had in mind one of the three Bandello stories about Louis XI (I.48, II.9, III.36) when he linked El villano en su rincón with the Italian collection. This seems unlikely, however, since none of these tales bears any resemblance to the play.
  10. For a more detailed examination of El villano en su rincón and La quinta de Florencia as "twin" plays, see my later chapter, "The Social Issues Dramatized".
  11. For more detailed analyses of the Boisteau and Belleforest adaptations of Bandello, see René Sturel, Bandello en France (Bordeaux-Paris, 1918); René Pruvost, Matteo Bandello and Elizabethan Fiction (Paris, 1937); Frank S. Hook, The French Bandello. The Original Text of Four of Belleforest's Histoires Tragiques (Missouri, 1948).
  12. The 1596 edition appears to have been lost, and the 1589 edition is at present unavailable. However, the contents of the latter are listed by Menéndez y Pelayo (Orígenes de la novela, XV, 35-37, n.3), and they would appear to correspond exactly with those of the 1603 edition. My quotations are all taken from this last edition.
  13. Palau y Dulcet notes that there were several editions



: of the Italian Bandello available in sixteenth-century Spain. He gives special mention to one published by Alonso de Ulloa, (Venice, 1556).

14. El castigo sin venganza, Boisteau and Belleforest, I, no. 11, 432-474. Historias trágicas, no. 11, ff. 289v-319v. Castelvines y Monteses, Boisteau and Belleforest, I, no. 3, 68-139. Historias trágicas, no. 3, ff. 48v-92r. El desdén vengado, Boisteau and Belleforest, I, no. 13, 514-572. Historias trágicas, no. 14, ff. 372r-405v. La quinta de Florencia, Boisteau and Belleforest, I, no. 12, 477-512. Historias trágicas, no. 12, ff. 320r-346r.
15. The term desengaño, as applied to other areas of Lope's work has, of course, further-reaching implications. For an outstanding study of its relevance generally, and of its culmination, as a theme, in La Dorotea, see Alan S. Trueblood, Experience and Artistic Expression: the Making of La Dorotea (Cambridge-Massachusetts, 1974, 529-602). It is also relevant to note here that the desengaño theme has already been associated with El castigo del discreto and El villano en su rincón: see El castigo del discreto, ed. William L. Fichter (New York, 1925); J. E. Varey, "Towards an Interpretation of Lope de Vega's El villano en su rincón", Studies in Spanish Literature of the Golden Age: Presented to Edward M. Wilson, ed. R. O. Jones (London, 1973), 315-337.

### Chapter III

#### Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* and Lope's

#### *El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi* : a Comparison

John Webster's dramatization of the Amalfi legend has always been more popular than Lope's. Written around 1614, *The Duchess of Malfi* has since been resurrected in three different forms, while *El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi* has received only one such literary tribute: a fictitious sequel written by a Spaniard of Lope's own century.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, despite the controversial nature of the theory that Webster used Lope's play as a secondary source for his, only two scholars have examined in any detail the different artistic purposes of the two dramatists. Neither of these commentators has questioned the traditional assumption that Webster fashioned from the Duchess's story a tragic masterpiece, while Lope made of it a run-of-the-mill *comedia de capa y espada*.<sup>2</sup> This study therefore has three main purposes. It aims firstly to examine the alleged relationship between the two plays, secondly to outline their very different characteristics, and thirdly to evaluate comparatively their artistic merits. As a basis for this work it is, of course, necessary to set down the data relating to the primary sources of our playwrights.

#### The Sources

I have argued elsewhere that *El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi* probably derives, in the main, from the original Italian version of Bandello I.26. Since Boklund's excellent study seems to have settled to general satisfaction the problem of Webster's primary sources, we may be similarly brief on the English dramatist's account. He almost certainly relied on W. Painter's translation of Boisteau and Belleforest (*The Palace of Pleasure*, 1581), possibly taking minor details for his



torture scenes from Phillip Sidney's Arcadia (1590) and S.Goulart's Admirable and Memorable Histories (trans. E.Grimestone, 1607). Bandello I.26 was not one of those tales altered extensively or essentially by Boisteau and Belleforest, and, as a translator, Painter tended to be literal rather than imaginative, so the two dramatists probably worked from very similar transcriptions of the Amalfi legend. This means that we should discount from the outset the likelihood of differences between the Lopean and Websterian reworkings of the story having arisen from disparities of detail in their respective sources. In point of fact, there are so many differences between the two dramatizations, that I am inclined to discount even the possibility of Webster's having drawn secondary source material from Lope's play.

#### The Question of Webster's Copying

Those who believe that Webster did borrow from Lope rest their case on the following parallels between the two works:

- i) Both tragedies end with a display of mutilated corpses. This feature does not derive from any of the prose versions.
- ii) Both Lope and Webster alter the Bandello tale by making the Duchess send Antonio away, as if in disgrace, when rumours of their marriage begin to circulate (Webster, III.ii; Lope, II.800-864).
- iii) The two dramatists change the time and place of Antonio's death, allowing him to be lured to the scene of his destruction by false promises.
- iv) In both plays the Duchess's wooing of Antonio begins with a scene in which she urges him to keep his hat on in her presence (Webster, II.i. 121-126; Lope, I.368-375).
- v) In the first act of both plays Antonio uses an extended ice/fire metaphor to express his love for the Duchess (Webster, I.ii.409-411; Lope, I.276-293).

Personally, I do not find any of these arguments very convincing. Points i and v fail to take account of the fact that Senecan violence and metaphorical juxtapositions

of natural extremes were standard features of tragic and amorous literature all over Europe during the seventeenth century. Points ii and iii are less obviously refutable, but may, in fact, be challenged on similar grounds. A fascination with deceit permeated the theatres of both England and Spain in this period. Therefore, since both Webster and Lope were faced with the necessity of compressing Bandello's story into a credible and theatrical whole, it is not surprising that they should have chosen - independently - to engineer the disappearance, and subsequent death, of Antonio, by means of trickery and deception.

The cúbrete parallel noted under point iv is more difficult to dismiss, because it is more precise. However, Boklund has shown that this passage in Webster is associated with other English references to the Concini affair: a scandal which arose from an Italian courtier's refusal to remove his hat in the presence of the French King. To Boklund's remarks about the hat-doffing incident as a contemporary topic of the English stage, we might add the observation that the same affair seems to have been a talking point in Spain. Pedro de Mexía makes a casual judgement on the subject: "Verdaderamente ello es cosa muy trabajosa quitar algunas veces el bonete a muchos, y sería mejor que nos saludásemos y honrásemos de palabra" (Silva de varia lección, 1550, ed. J. García Soriano, Madrid, 1933, I, 114). More relevantly still, El castigo del discreto and La vida y muerte del rey Wamba share with El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi a contextual linking of the cúbrete notion and the idea of social change:

Con los bonetes quitados  
están aguardando allí;  
que se cubran les decid.  
(Vida y muerte del rey Wamba, Ac. VII, 132a).

Yo, con igual cortesía,  
sin cubrirme, lo agradezco;  
mas ellos me hacen cubrir  
y así me dice el más necio.  
(El castigo del discreto, ed. Fichter, I.  
316-319).

Obviously, the Concini scandal - or something like it - had given overtones of topicality to the whole hat-doffing business in both England and Spain. Consequently,



the conclusion that Lope and Webster both saw its relevance to the first confrontation between the Duchess and Antonio, and decided, again independently, to make passing reference to it, seems to me to carry the weight of feasibility.

Clearly, none of my arguments against Webster's dependence on Lope is conclusive. However, even R.W. Dent's exhaustive study of Webster's erudition (John Webster's Borrowing, Berkeley, 1960) yields no evidence to suggest that the English dramatist knew Spanish. Furthermore, the few parallels between his play and Lope's can be explained in terms of literary trends and contemporary topics, and the two works are, as we shall see in a moment, vastly different in both detail and general design. Therefore, it seems sensible to assume - pending further evidence to the contrary - that each of the two tragedies was written without reference to the other.

#### The Dissimilarities Outlined

It is fairly clear, in fact, that almost all the major differences between the Spanish and English dramatizations of the Amalfi theme, stem from the fact that, in this case, Lope's tragic vision was more socially oriented, and less "cosmic", than Webster's. Before elaborating on this underlying disparity, however, we should tabulate briefly the differences of detail.

- i) The marriage: Lope lays greater emphasis than Webster on the unorthodoxy of the mésalliance, and on its success as a love match in the case of Antonio and the Duchess.
- ii) The murderers: Lope differs from both Bandello and Webster in giving the Duchess only one vengeful brother - not a man of the Church - and allowing him to be aided by a rival suitor. He does not make rounded characters of these murderers. Webster develops the personalities of Bandello's brothers, and makes of the Italian's shadowy Bosola - omitted by Lope - a major protagonist.
- iii) The subplot: Lope's subplot involves a community of peasants who deal in a humane and sensible way with an affair of honour. Webster's centres around an adulterous affair between the Cardinal and Julia.

- iv) The eldest son: Lope allows the Duchess's eldest son to sympathize with the mésalliance, and finally to take a vow of vengeance on the murderers. Webster turns his boy-ruler into a symbol of hope for the future.
- v) The denouement: Lope deals in a rapid and compressed manner with the final death scenes. Webster draws out the denouement for two acts, including a dumbshow, a graveyard episode, torture scenes and a horrific piling up of corpses.
- vi) Style and tone: Lope's tragedy is less violent and rhetorical than Webster's. It is, in fact, characteristic of the tragedia patética genre, while the English play is a tragedia morata.

### The Websterian Issues

In order to understand why Webster altered the Amalfi tale more extensively than Lope did, it is necessary to reach some conclusion about the issues at stake in the English play, and the central cosmic concerns which link it with Webster's other great tragedy, The White Devil (1612?). Commentators of these twin works are divided, broadly speaking, into two main groups. There are those who maintain that, taken together, the two plays are illustrative of a chaotic universe, in which virtue is weaker than corruption, and courageous stoicism the only viable attitude left to man. Others would argue that the strain of poetic justice in The White Devil and the optimistic overtones of The Duchess of Malfi mark Webster out as a fundamentally orthodox Christian dramatist.<sup>3</sup> My own sympathies lie with the latter camp.

The White Devil raises, but does not answer, questions about man's relationship with the forces of good and evil. Almost every major character is a bundle of moral contradictions, and the precarious balance of young Giovanni's innocence sums up the problem most central to Webster's tragic vision: the human potential for effective virtue:

Giovanni: Study your prayers, sir, and be penitent...  
 Flamineo: Study my prayers? He threatens me  
 divinely, I am falling to pieces already;



I care not though...He hath his  
uncle's villainous look already.  
(V.iv.133-136).

The fact that the three most important characters of The White Devil have essentially recognizable, if more sharply defined, counterparts in The Duchess of Malfi, of itself suggests that the later play sets out to answer the questions posed by the earlier tragedy. The magnificent, but morally ambivalent, Vittoria, becomes in The Duchess of Malfi an almost superhuman heroine. The confused "tool villain", Flamineo, is developed under the name of Bosola to a representative of sin turned to penitence, and the deliberately ambiguous Giovanni becomes in the young Amalfi, a symbol of positive virtue and hope for the future:

Let us make noble use  
of this great ruin, and join all our force  
to establish this young hopeful gentleman  
in's mother's right.  
(V.v.133-136).

No wonder, then, that Vittoria's tragedy of glorious, but evil, resolution, ends with an ironically hollow maxim ("Let guilty men remember their black deeds/do lean on crutches made of slender reeds"), while the Duchess's tragedy of virtuous dignity finishes on a note of unforced Christian triumph:

I have ever thought  
nature doth nothing so great, for great men,  
as when she's pleased to make them lords  
of truth:  
integrity of life is fame's best friend,  
which nobly (beyond death) shall crown the end.  
(V.v.140-144).

#### A Contrast of Tragic Visions

It will be clear from what has already been said about El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi that Lope found in Bandello's tale potential of a very different kind from that which seems to have attracted Webster. The practical solution pointed up by the Spaniard's subplot emphasizes

the fact that his is a social tragedy with cosmic undertones, while the Julia-Cardinal subplot stresses the overriding importance of moral issues in Webster. The same disparity of basic purpose accounts for the vastly different roles allotted by the two dramatists to the young Duke, and for the diminished interest in the social implications of the mésalliance in Webster's work.

It has been argued, of course, that the unorthodoxy of the Duchess's marriage singles her out, in the English play, as a representative of honesty in a corrupt society.<sup>4</sup> It would be difficult to disagree with this contention, since her justification of the match is clearly meant to bespeak natural integrity: "The birds that live i'th' field... / live happier than we; for they may choose their mates" (III.v.25-27). Nevertheless, once Webster has married off his heroine, establishing her essential innocence in the affair, and using the circumstance to set the tragic ball rolling, he pays relatively little attention to the marital progress of the unequal couple. Unlike Lope's hero, who shares the stage with his wife, even after their marriage, Webster's Antonio fades largely into the background from the middle of the third act onwards. It is true that both dramatists endow Antonio with a weaker personality than that which they give to his wife. The passivity of Webster's hero in the bedroom scene finds its counterpart in the cowardice of Lope's protagonist at the point when Julio approaches. However, it seems to me that whereas Lope is genuinely interested in the weak man/strong woman combination per se, Webster's intention is rather to ensure that Antonio, as a character, does not distract attention from his wife's steady growth to symbolic stature. After the first wooing scene, for example, Webster's Duchess never again encourages Antonio to take the initiative in their partnership, and the English dramatist is certainly less concerned than Lope with the portrayal of a blissfully happy mésalliance:

Your kiss is colder  
than that I have seen a holy Anchorite  
give to a dead man's skull.  
(III.v.103-105).



### The Villains

Given that Lope was more interested than Webster in the social possibilities of the Amalfi legend, it is not surprising that he, unlike the Englishman, should have made less of the murderers' psychological motivation, than of the code of honour as represented by them. Little can be said about Julio and Otavio except that they are portrayed as out-and-out villains: cruel, petty-minded and treacherous. They illustrate the evil use which may be made of a supposedly elevated moral code. It is clear, by contrast, that Webster fully intended to play up the psychological and symbolic potential of his villains.

Several critics have been worried by the fact that the Duchess's brothers have no concrete reason for objecting to her remarriage in the English play. Certainly, they do not fear the social disgrace of a mésalliance as Lope's Julio does, and it has been proposed that Ferdinand at least is motivated by an incestuous love for his sister.<sup>5</sup> There is, in fact, much in the text to support the "incest" theory, but it seems to me that, as an explanation of the driving force behind the Duchess's murder, it is unnecessary. Webster's villains start out, quite simply, as fascinating studies in different kinds of perversion and corruption. As such, they need no specific reason for committing an evil deed. The rapid pace and vivid characterization of the first three acts leave the vague, but artistically satisfactory impression that the quietly ruthless Cardinal is working towards his sister's ruin for ugly reasons best known to himself, and that Ferdinand enjoys the madman's privilege of not having to account for his actions:

So, I will only study to seem  
the thing I am not: I could kill her now,  
in you, or in myself.  
(II.v.82-84).

The case of Bosola is rather different. Webster makes it clear from the start that there are reasons for his unscrupulousness, and his continual self-scrutiny earmarks

him as a complex moral entity even during the first stages of the play. Much has been written about Bosola, and it is clear that, in enlarging him, Webster made one of his most successful elaborations on the original tale.<sup>6</sup> Above all, he is a fine miniature of the forces of good and evil at war in human nature:

Oh poor Antonio, though nothing be so needful  
to thy estate as pity, yet I find  
nothing so dangerous: I must look to my footing.  
(V.iii.386-388).

In point of fact, as the tragedy nears its end, all three villains take on a semi-symbolic value. Bosola acts out the moral struggle which precedes penitence and (implicitly) salvation, and the Cardinal sheds his Machiavellian skin to become representative of the soul which allows even the last-minute opportunity for contrition to pass:

I am puzzell'd in a question about hell:  
he says in hell there's one material fire,  
and yet it shall not burn all men alike.  
Lay him by.  
(V.v.1-4).

Even Ferdinand comes to stand, in a less obvious way, for the wilful human blindness which denies doggedly - and wrongly - man's capacity for virtue and happiness:

I do account this world but a dog-kennel:  
I will vault credit and affect high pleasures,  
beyond death.  
(V.v.84-86).

As might be expected, then, it is, more than anything, an immense difference in the portrayal of villainy which distinguishes Webster's moral and symbolic play from Lope's social tragedy. Bearing in mind this fundamental dissimilarity of artistic purpose and tragic conception, we have now to decide whether the English work is really as superior to the Spanish as we are usually asked to believe.



### A Comparison of Artistic Qualities

In order to forestall the objection that I am questioning Webster's greatness simply to boost Lope's reputation, I hasten to state that both dramatists have had their critics. If El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi has been accused of triteness, poor characterization and servile adherence to its novelistic source, The Duchess of Malfi has been censored for certain improbabilities of plot, and an excess of uncontrolled emotion and gory detail in its last two acts.<sup>7</sup> My own view is that although neither of these plays is a first-class tragedy, the above-mentioned criticisms are not - by and large - the right ones.

We need not be detained long by arguments of Lope's shallowness or Webster's implausibility. Lope extracts from the Amalfi theme a maximum of thematic interest, developing with care and emphasis the implications of the mésalliance in an honour-bound society, and the life-related concept of the strong-woman/weak man partnership. Thus he raises his play well above the level of triviality. Equally, it is unfair to accuse Webster of marring a well-conceived tragedy by neglecting little details, like the irrationality of the brothers' persecution of the Duchess, and the heroine's apparent lack of concern for her eldest son. Just as Webster's artistic purposes do not demand that the brothers' villainy be explained in practical terms, the overall scheme of his work makes it unnecessary for the Duchess's relationship with her eldest son to figure anywhere in the action. The arguments that Lope is inferior to Webster in the art of character-drawing, and that Webster himself is guilty of overstating tragic horror, require fuller consideration.

### Tragic Characterization: the Secondary Figures

It is true that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi has a few minor figures who fulfil their dramatic functions without ever becoming rounded characters: Julio, Otavio and Amalfi all fall into this category. However, I have already argued that Lope deliberately refrains from developing these figures because the concepts which they represent are more important to his fundamental purposes than their personalities. Consequently, it is unfair to pick, as some



critics have done, on these more "wooden" of Lope's creations, and compare them unfavourably with Webster's Bosola, Otavio and Amalfi have their counterparts in the English play in the shapes of Delio, the eldest son, and the "sugar-stick" Malateste. Bosola has no equivalent in Lope because the social causes of the Spanish tragedy do not call for a personification of man's moral struggle. Again, if it is to be argued that Cariola has more of flesh and blood than the Livia of Lope's play, then this is surely balanced out by Lope's psychologically interesting analysis of the servants' reasons for abandoning their mistress (III.184-296). This part of the play has no parallel in Webster, whose servants and courtiers tend to be useful as messengers and publicizers of vital information, but colourless as personalities.

As regards the depiction of the more important secondary characters, I have already argued that Webster's brothers are more interesting figures than Lope's murderers, but against this should be set the fact that Lope takes more care than does Webster in his presentation of Antonio. We are therefore left with a comparative consideration of the portrayal of the Duchess in the two works, and it seems to me that this is where Lope positively excels Webster.

### The Duchess

Both dramatists succeed, of course, in the creation of a tragic heroine remarkable for her spirited self-possession and courageous integrity. However, Lope's tragic protagonists, even at their most dignified, are rarely "grand", and his Duchess is no exception to the general rule. Despite, for example, her sedate and proper wooing of Antonio at the start of the play, she is human enough to be mildly impatient: "¿Dónde está tu ingenio, Antonio?" (I.475). By contrast, it is typical of Webster's heroine that she should partly erase the playful impression made by her coy advances to Antonio, by ending the scene with a "philosophical" speech ("The misery of us that are born great/we are forced to woo because none dare woo us", I.ii.427-445). This sort of touch makes it clear from the outset that the English Duchess is destined to become a symbolic



representative in the last stages of the play, and that her high-spirited bearing must always be ready, therefore, to turn to dignified courage. It is true that Lope's heroine is also brave, and that she, too, is almost always in control of the major decisions of the plot. However, when it comes to the crucial points, she is a less magnificent, and more poignant, figure than Webster's Duchess (eg. III.553-568). Consequently, it is not surprising that while Webster's heroine finally becomes too splendid, in her courage and virtue, to be pitied, Lope's Duchess is, at the corresponding stage of her tragedy, pathetic in the extreme:

Pull, and pull strongly, for your able strength,  
must pull down heaven upon me:  
yet stay, heaven's gates are not so highly arch'd  
as Princes' palaces, they that enter there  
must go upon their knees.  
(IV.ii.248-252).

¿Cuya fuera esta crueldad  
sino de un infame monstruo?...  
¡Marido y señor del alma,  
Antonio, querido Antonio!  
(III.974-988).

It seems to me, then, that the scales are finally tilted by the Spanish portrayal of the Duchess. Lope's heroine is pathetic enough to fulfil completely her tragic role, while Webster's is ultimately too much of a symbol to effect the same emotional climax. Obviously, neither dramatist can be accused of unconvincing character-drawing in his reworking of the Amalfi tale, but on balance, I am inclined to think that Lope is probably superior, rather than inferior, to Webster, in this respect. This, of course, raises the question of whether Webster spoils the tragic effect of his denouement by including an excessive amount of violence, as well as by investing his protagonists with too much symbolic significance.

#### Tragic Excesses and Overstated Theme

There is clearly something to be said for the above argument. The intense ideology of Webster's play probably explains why he piles on the agony to such an

overwhelming degree, and allows initially well-drawn protagonists like Bosola, the Duchess and the Cardinal to lose something of their human personalities in the final working out of abstract issues. Nevertheless, the fact remains that these developments do make for a decrease in tragic emotion. Furthermore, episodes like, for example, the graveyard scene, do indicate an excessive straining after stage effect on Webster's part, and the gory detail of the torture scenes stretches tragic horror almost to the point of melodramatic absurdity. In short, I think that in emphasizing the holocaustal nature of his tragic denouement, Webster commits the artistic sin of sacrificing characterization and subtlety of tragic effect to theme.

Insofar as Webster's play is made less effective as a tragedy by its excessive emphasis on theme, it shares a dramatic defect with Lope's work. El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi undoubtedly lacks the moral complexity and tragic ambiguity of the Spaniard's best tragedies. This is clearly due to the fact that, in his adaptation of the Amalfi tale, Lope, like Webster, allows a central moral purpose to gain the upper hand. Because his championship of the unequal marriage, and condemnation of the rigid codes which destroy it, are put across with such force, the Spaniard's account of the tragic circumstances are ultimately rather one-sided. Hence, El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi has pathos in plenty, a fair degree of horror, which is kept under better control than it is in Webster's play, and themes and characters which are, on the whole, carefully developed. However, just as Webster's play lacks the pathos, full characterization and tragic subtlety of The White Devil, Lope's work is probably, by his own standards, second-rate. Nevertheless, as I have tried to show at various points in this study, both El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi and The Duchess of Malfi are good plays. Moreover, providing that due account is taken of the different purposes and techniques of the two dramatists, there need be no hesitation in saying that they stand side-by-side as equally good plays.



Footnotes to Chapter III

1. The modern reworkings of Webster's tragedy include two plays and one novel. The plays are: Lewis Theobald's The Fatal Secret (London, 1735), and Henry Horne's The Tragedy of the Duchess of Malfi (London, 1850). The novel is David Stacton's A Dancer in Darkness (London, 1960). The sequel to Lope's play was written by Diego Muxet de Solís (Comedia de la venganza de la Duquesa de Amalfi, in Comedias humanas y divinas, Brussels, 1624).
  
2. These detailed comparative studies are: John E. Houseman, Parallel Plots in English and Spanish Drama of the Early Seventeenth Century (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1951); Gunnar Boklund, The Duchess of Malfi: Sources, Themes, Characters (Massachusetts, 1962). Other scholars who have contributed in this comparative field are: Domenico Morellini (Giovanna d'Aragona, Duchessa d'Amalfi: spigolature storiche e letterarie (a proposito d'una novella di Matteo Bandello), Cesena, 1906); Adolf Friedrich von Schack (Geschichte der Dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien, 3 vols, Frankfurt-on-Main, 1854). Karl Kiesow ("Die Verschiedenen Bearbeitungen der Novelle von der Herzogin von Amalfi des Bandello in den Literaturen des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts", Anglia, XVII (1895), 199-258); Antonio Gasparetti ("Giovan Battista Giraldi e Lope de Vega", Bulletin Hispanique, XXXII (1930), 372-403); John Loftis ("The Duchess of Malfi on the Spanish and English Stages", Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama, XII (1969), 25-31). Morellini, Gasparetti and Loftis have supported the theory that Webster borrowed from Lope. Schack and Kiesow have refuted it.
  
3. Prominent among the scholars who see Webster as a tragic pessimist are: W.A. Edwards ("John Webster", Scrutiny, II (1933), 12-23); John Russell Brown (ed. The Duchess of Malfi, Revels Plays, London, 1963);

- Una Ellis-Fermor (The Jacobean Drama, third edition, London, 1953); F.L. Lucas (The Works of John Webster, 4 vols, London, 1927, II); Irving Ribner ("Webster's Italian Tragedies", Tulane Drama Review, V (1961), 106-118); Ian Scott-Kilvert (John Webster, London, 1964); Bernard de Bear Nicol (Varieties of Dramatic Experience, London, 1969); Charles R. Forker ("Love, Death and Fame: the Grotesque Tragedy of John Webster", Anglia, XCI (1973), 194-218). The opposing viewpoint is held by: Travis Bogard (The Tragic Satire of John Webster, Los Angeles, 1955); Clifford Leech (Webster: The Duchess of Malfi, London, 1963); Elizabeth Brennan (ed. The Duchess of Malfi, The New Mermaids Series, London, 1964); Muriel C. Bradbrook (Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy, Cambridge, 1935); Richard Allan Davidson ("John Webster's Moral View Re-examined", Moderna Språk, LXIII (1969), 213-223).
4. See F.W. Wadsworth, "Webster's Duchess of Malfi in the Light of Contemporary Ideas on Marriage and Remarriage", Philological Quarterly, XXXV (1956), 394-407.
5. See Elizabeth Brennan, "The Relationship Between Brother and Sister in the Plays of John Webster", Modern Language Review, LVIII (1963), 488-494.
6. See, for example, Clarence Valentine Boyer, The Villain as Hero in Elizabethan Tragedy (London, 1914); C.G. Thayer, "The Ambiguity of Bosola", Studies in Philology, LIV (1957), 162-171.
7. See, for example, W.A. Edwards, "John Webster", Scrutiny, II (1933), 12-23; William Archer, The Old Drama and the New (London, 1923); T.B. Tomlinson, A Study of Elizabethan and Jacobean Tragedy (Melbourne, 1964); John E. Houseman, Parallel Plots in English and Spanish Drama of the Early Seventeenth Century (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of London, 1951).



## Chapter IV

### Lope and the "tragedia al estilo español"

Lope allows one of his characters to describe El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi as a tragedia (III.1012-1013). Since there has been much critical disagreement as to the implications which this term might have had for the dramatist and his contemporaries, an attempt to outline and classify the "tragic vision" which emerges from his theatre generally, is fundamental to a contextual study of our play. Abstract definitions of tragedy as a literary phenomenon have, of course, been innumerable, and it will become apparent later that my own criterion rests on the Sophoclean notion of a confrontation between man and forces stronger than himself. However, twentieth-century theories are of less importance, in evaluating the revolutionary impact of Lope's conception of tragedy, than an examination of the ways in which sixteenth-century theorists and dramatists had interpreted the genre.

### The Early Spanish Tragedians

It has already been pointed out that pre-Lope tragedy was more obviously Senecan than Aristotelian in its emphasis on vivid rhetoric, violent emotion and gory sensationalism.<sup>1</sup> However, this bias towards the "grand" style, and the concomitant pursuit of thorough emotional catharsis were, as we shall see later, in complete accordance with the Aristotelian precepts propagated by sixteenth-century theorists of literature. Furthermore, the concept of tragedy as a morally instructive genre - inherent in Aristotle's view of the tragic hero as a good, but not perfect, individual - was easily adjustable to the Christian didacticism which seems to have coloured the tragic vision of these early dramatists. For example, tragedies like Pérez de Oliva's Hécuba triste (published 1585) and Cristóbal de Virués's Elisa Dido

(published 1596) managed to combine Christian content with classical form, by allowing the chorus to preach orthodox sermons on human suffering:

O míseros mortales,  
a cuán graves pasiones  
está sujeta nuestra corta vida,  
ved de ánimos reales.  
Elisa Dido, f.168b.

Similarly, Argensola's Alejandra (1582?), Rey de Artieda's Los amantes (1581) and Lasso de la Vega's La honra de Dido restaurada introduce stylized allegorical figures (Fama, Virtud...) specifically to point up the Christian conclusions implicit in their catastrophes. Bermúdez's Nise plays are, on the whole, subtler works, but even they are based on a classically "unified" pattern of events, which also hints at the unshakeable foundations of cosmic order and Providential justice:

Y bástete, Señor, que me conozco,  
y me conozco digno de las penas  
que tú me das en este oscuro abismo.  
Nise laureada (published 1577), p.347.

Unqualified generalizations are, of course, inappropriate, and one or two of the earlier Spanish tragedians do seem to have struck out from the norm in some respects. Alonso de la Vega, for instance, wrote his Tragedia llamada Serafina (1566) in simple and restrained prose, while the anonymous author of the Farsa a manera de tragedia (1537) was clearly more concerned with an exploration of the emotional scope offered by the tragi-comic form, than with the preaching of moral lessons. However, judging from what I have read, Spanish tragedy before the Lopean revolution seems to have been, for the most part, narrow in conception and predictable in implication. Hemmed in by Senecan/Aristotelian traditions, and conditioned by Christian teachings on death, evil and retribution, it appears to have sacrificed pathos to didacticism, artistic complexity to "cathartic" violence and verisimilitude to stilted grandeur.

These - inevitably oversimplified - conclusions on



early Spanish tragedy raise the three interlocking questions which have long been central to the controversy about Lope's status as a tragedian: was he, too, restricted in the tragic genre by his Christian background? Was he, like his predecessors, strongly influenced by the Aristotelian precepts of tragedy? Or did he, in fact, break with these classical "rules" so completely that most of his tragic output is better described as tragic-comedy than as tragedy?

### Critical Work to Date

Even amongst those critics who work from the assumption that a seventeenth-century Catholic country could produce good tragedians, there is a marked lack of agreement about the kind of tragedies which Lope and his contemporaries were writing. Duncan Moir has used Lope's own Arte nuevo de hacer comedias (1609) as a central piece of evidence for his argument that Golden Age dramatists followed closely and consciously the classical modes of tragedy advocated by neo-Aristotelian theorists. His interpretation of both the Arte nuevo and the plays is in direct conflict with that put forward by C. Pérez and F. Sánchez Escribano, who maintain that Lope adjusted to the needs of his age many of the most basic Aristotelian precepts. J. W. Sage has taken the latter argument still further, contending that Lope by-passed almost all the standard literary "rules" of his age, and defied traditional distinctions between tragedy and comedy to such an extent that his conception of tragedy - like his conception of comedy - was ultimately tragi-comic.<sup>2</sup>

Before working through the issues which surround Lope's attitude towards traditional tragic criteria, it is necessary to take some stand on the more fundamental problem raised by those scholars who regard the general principles of tragedy as incompatible with those of Christianity. With specific reference to seventeenth-century Spain, C. D. Ley and A. Reichenberger have argued that Christian optimism in the face of death, and Christian belief in cosmic justice, were environmental

factors which ran counter to the theatrical evocation of the profoundest tragic emotions. Their thesis has been opposed by two, largely contradictory, arguments. A.A. Parker believes that there was, in the Golden Age theatre, a reconciliation between tragic vision and Christian precepts; he has outlined an underlying pattern of diffused responsibility, tragic culpability and merited punishment as basic to this fusion. On the other hand, J.W. Sage has suggested that innocence, victimization and a sense of cosmic injustice played a significant part in Lope's tragic repertoire, the perfectly orthodox notion of God's inscrutability leaving a margin for the inclusion of such non-Christian elements.<sup>3</sup>

### The Tragic and the Christian

One of the most convincing answers to the general tragedy/Christianity dilemma has been advanced by Elias Schwarz ("The Possibilities of Christian Tragedy", College English, XXI (1960), 208-212). His argument that dramatic tragedy has never been alien to Christian cultures because Christians have never, in practice, reacted differently from non-Christians, to the tragic experience, seems to me to reach the heart of the matter. In the theatre, as in real life, the spectacle of death or intense suffering is almost bound to evoke a violent emotional response which is too strongly instinctive to be rationalized. The Christian may be aware that he ought to react to the tragic situation with humility, trust and optimism, but because he is a human being, despair, doubts and rebellion will out: "Talk to me about the truth of religion and I'll listen gladly. Talk to me about the duty of religion and I'll listen submissively. But don't come talking to me about the consolations of religion or I shall suspect that you don't understand" (C.S. Lewis, A Grief Observed, London, 1961, p. 27). It is not, therefore, surprising that many Christian dramatists should, in practice, have produced artistically effective tragedies, or that a life-centred writer like Lope should have found in "everyman's" conflict between Christian principle and instinctive emotional reaction,



an important source of tragic ironies and tensions.

It could well be argued, in fact, that one of the most revolutionary aspects of Lope's tragic vision was the depth and complexity with which it tackled the issues most central to real-life tragedy in a Christian context: the responsibility which man bears for his own disasters, the possibility of Providential contribution to the catastrophic build-up, and the sense of injustice resultant from unmerited and untimely death. These seem to me to be the most consistently important dilemmas raised by Lope's tragic plays, and unlike earlier Spanish tragedians, he rarely allows pious overtones to imply comfortingly orthodox answers to them. For example, martyric tragedies like Pedro Carbonero and El Hamete de Toledo point up quietly but unmistakably the asperity of a creed which demands trusting humility in return for vitality crushed by premature death:

Cerbín Daráte Almanzor  
regalada vida...  
Crecerá tu vida  
como verde cedro,  
casaráte Pedro,  
con mora garrida...  
Pedro No lo quiere Dios, Cerbín.  
Pedro Carbonero, Ac. XI, 163b-164a.

Similarly, plays like La inocente sangre and La hermosa Ester emphasize the unintelligibility of innocent suffering, thereby hinting strongly at the apparent injustice of the cosmic workings:

Tal vez castiga Dios por los mayores  
la humilde plebe, aunque inocente viva.  
La hermosa Ester, Ac. III, 314b-315a.

### Innocence as a Tragic Criterion

There is some evidence to suggest that this problem of human culpability - the most axiomatic issue of all - was one to which Lope gave considerable thought. In a letter to the Duke of Sessa he makes the provocative suggestion that God is liable for human suffering only insofar as he allows men to pass

judgement and sentence on their own crimes:"Con lo poco que he leído de la escritura sagrada,hallo que las más de las sentencias que daba Dios,era poniendo a los reos de los delitos por jueces,encubriéndoles que se las daba a sí mismos"(A.González de Amezúa y Mayo,Lope de Vega y sus cartas,Madrid,1935,vol.III,p.82).This same view of the tragic pattern would seem to lie behind La desdichada Estefanía,which finally envisages man's recognition and acceptance of his own guilt as the most terrible punishment of all:

Yo propio me agravio...  
mi culpa confieso,Rey;  
no quise pasarme a Francia,  
sino pagar,como es justo,  
quien los inocentes mata.  
La desdichada Estefanía,Ac.VIII,363a-363b.

Again,a brief comment made by a minor character in El piadoso aragonés acquires general significance when related to the many Lope plays - El caballero de Olmedo, Adonis y Venus and El Marqués de Mantua,for example - in which the Aristotelian fatal flaw makes a vital contribution to the catastrophic build-up:

Que de ordinario por yerros  
comienzan nuestras desgracias.  
El piadoso aragonés,Ac.X,573b.

Clearly,then,it would be a gross oversimplification to suggest that Lope's tragic vision rested solely on the premise of human helplessness in the face of overwhelming cosmic forces.In fact,time and again one finds that an awareness of human culpability as part of the tragic situation fits in,in Lope's theatre,with the Parkerian pattern of divided sympathies and diffused responsibilities.The important point,however,is that the catastrophe nearly always seems vastly disproportionate to its causal factors,and the "punishment" of the participants much in excess of their crimes.In El bastardo Mudarra,for example,a terrifying chain of revenge murders is sparked off by nothing more than the bravado of a young gallant in interaction with the petty vindictiveness of his aunt and the foolish treachery of his uncle.



In El castigo sin venganza the burden of tragic culpability borne by all three protagonists is enormous, but so are the emotional pressures against which they struggle, and the chain of error upon which plays like Los comendadores de Córdoba and La hermosa Alfreda are based, involves more flawed judgements than sins or moral weaknesses. In other words, Lope's tragic vision hinges not only on the real-life conflict between Christian principle and instinctive emotional reaction, but also on the real-life conflation of circumstances in which every participant bears some degree of tragic responsibility, and in which mitigating factors intervene to make it apparent that no individual involved fully deserves the degree of suffering finally meted out to him.

Fate, the Hand of God, Bad Luck...

Much has been written about the supernatural in Lope's theatre, and the general conclusion that our dramatist held the orthodox belief in "astral inclinations" which were strictly subordinate to the Free Will of an individual, is no doubt correct in essence.<sup>4</sup> However, "fate" as it figures in Lope's tragic plays frequently has highly unorthodox implications, because it strengthens the above-mentioned sense of cosmic injustice. Despite his own allegations to the contrary (in the prologue to El castigo sin venganza), startling manifestations of the supernatural do have some part to play in Lope's tragic vision. Omens, prophecies and apparitions, handled in an ambiguous, psychological/occult/Christian manner, give to plays like El caballero de Olmedo and El Hamete de Toledo a sense of mystery and semi-fatality. Similarly, the mock-serious portrayals of love as an overwhelming tragic force in Adonis y Venus and Porfiar hasta morir, allow for an ambivalent exploration of the unauthorized notion of tragic predestination:

Venus	Y eres tan cruel tirano que a mí propia me has herido... De Adonis me enamoraste... ¡Muerta soy, pierdo el juicio!
Cúpido	¿Qué importa que yo os provoque, si tenéis libre albedrío?

Pero no hacéis resistencia  
 a vuestro propio albedrío.  
Adonis y Venus, Ac. VI, 21b-22a.

However, it is more common for "fate" in Lope's tragic plays to take the form of minor mishaps: a lost letter in Pedro Carbonero, conversations overheard and misinterpreted in El Duque de Viseo, a mistaken identity in La desdichada Estefanía. All trivial accidents which are ironic because their repercussions would not normally be tragic, unorthodox in implication because they suggest the intervention of some malign external force, and in keeping with Lope's tragic vision as a whole because they are a true reflection of the fatal slips which give to real-life tragedy its overtones of cosmic injustice.

#### Understatement of Tone and Style

Just as Lope's conception of tragedy differed fundamentally, in its lifelike patterns and subversive implications, from that of his predecessors, it also moved away from the grandiose and melodramatic modes of expression which had traditionally characterized tragic drama. J.W. Sage (Lope de Vega: El caballero de Olmedo, Grant and Cutler Ltd., 1974) has already suggested that Lope's catastrophes tend to emphasize pathos more than terror, and I would agree that emotional and linguistic restraint are important features of his tragic vision. Los comendadores de Córdoba and La hermosa Ester, for example, end with the suggestion that the tragic cycle is about to repeat itself. Their final mood of quiet despair is shared by other plays like La inocente sangre and La estrella de Sevilla (if it is by Lope), which underline the agonizing isolation of the tragic survivor. Almost always, the ultimate effect of these anti-climatic denouements is one of intense disquiet, rather than of violent emotional catharsis:

Estrella Señor, no ha de ser mi esposo  
 hombre que a mi hermano mata,  
 aunque le quiero y adoro.  
 (Vase)



Sancho Y yo, señor, por amarla,  
no es justicia que lo sea.  
(Vase).

La estrella de Sevilla, ed. H. Thomas,  
Oxford, 1923, III. 867-871.

In these plays, as in many others, including Adonis y Venus, La desdichada Estefanía and La bella Aurora, the subdued mood of the tragic climax is matched by a determinedly non-rhetorical style, and it is obviously significant that the verse form most characteristic of Lope's death scenes is the one which he himself associated with non-emotive narration, the romance (see, for example, El castigo sin venganza, El caballero de Olmedo and El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi). It is clear that, while distilling from the tragic situation a maximum of emotional and intellectual intensity, Lope was attempting to minimize on every level its potentially melodramatic elements.

Indeed, Lope's conception of the tragic genre was so restrained that he was even able to envisage deathless tragedy - a rare phenomenon in any age, and one which was completely alien to, for example, the Elizabethans. La estrella de Sevilla and El premio de la hermosura succeed in communicating a sense of silent horror appropriate to situations which involve emotional and spiritual, rather than physical, annihilation, and the Queen in El testimonio vengado advances a startlingly modern argument for "living death" as the ultimate in tragic punishment:

Yo te condeno a que vivas,  
vive, y viva tu pecado  
siempre en tu rostro y contigo.  
El testimonio vengado, Ac. IV, 223b.

I would contend, in fact, that horror, in remarkably subtle forms, is as central to Lope's tragic vision as is pathos. The Duke's death-trap in El castigo sin venganza, for example, is positively spine-chilling, and the scene in which the protagonist of Los comendadores de Córdoba grasps the full extent of his tragic guilt, exudes a sense of icy numbness which is more horrific

than a stage full of severed limbs could ever be:

La misma espada que cifo,  
y que desnudo, que es ésta,  
pasó su pecho siete veces;  
y ahora a tus manos llega  
desnuda como la ves,  
a que cortes mi cabeza.  
Los comendadores de Córdoba, Ac. XI, 299a.

However, it is very evident that the pathos of the tragic situation came through in Lope's theatre more clearly than it ever had in the works of previous tragedians because he - again following the patterns of real-life tragedy - aimed at an emotional response in which "silent terror" and intense disquiet took the place of violently horrific excesses.

#### Traditional Tragic Theory and Revolutionary Tragic Practice

I have argued that Lope's "tragedia al estilo español" was essentially revolutionary. It is now necessary to decide how its non-traditional features squared with the precepts upheld by the neo-Aristotelian theorists of tragedy. Going back to the Ars poetica itself, it is clear that Lope generally followed the Aristotelian notions of a tragedy as a play based on past history, and a tragic protagonist as an individual of elevated social status. It is equally clear that he differed from Aristotle in more fundamental respects: firstly by conceiving of the tragic situation as one in which "fate" and a sense of cosmic injustice played as great a part as human culpability, and secondly by substituting thought-provoking perturbación for vehement emotional purgation. However, before jumping to the conclusion that the tragic practice of the seventeenth century was therefore incompatible, in essence, with its tragic theory, due account should be taken of the fact that theoretical literature relating to the stage was, itself, in a state of evolution throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>5</sup> In point of fact, a reading of the major tragic theorists of this period reveals such



a clear chronological progression of thought on the subjects of tragic culpability and catharsis, that the likelihood of Lope's conception of tragedy having become standard, to the point of dictating even the theoretical Spanish norms of tragic expression, seems to me to be strong.

Alonso López Pinciano's sixteenth-century depiction of the tragic hero implies an entirely Aristotelian view of human culpability as the primary causal factor: "Sea la persona ni buena ni mala" (Filosofía de antigua poética, 1596, p. 335). A few years later Francisco de Cascales was much more inclined to emphasize the innocence of the tragic victim, and the operation of some outside force which interacted with his fallibility to bring about a disastrous situation:

/El héroe/ es aquel que padece por algún pecado, hecho sin malicia, por imprudencia, y por algún error humano.  
Tablas poéticas (1617), p. 318.

Causan admiración las cosas que suceden sin pensar, o porque creemos venir de la mano de Dios, o de su propio movimiento.  
Tablas poéticas (1617), p. 288-289.

Finally, by the mid 1620's, González de Salas and Francisco de Barreda were coming very close to a definition of the tragic situation as it figured in Lope's theatre. Barreda hints at the artistic validity of the catastrophic chain which implicates several characters:

Esto está mal entendido de los críticos que piensan que se ha de considerar en que no sea más que una persona que llaman fatal ... Pues si sucede que en un caso haya muchas personas que con igualdad intervienen, ¿por qué la comedia que retrata a ese caso no le retratará con esas personas igualmente?  
Francisco de Barreda, El mejor Príncipe Trajano Augusto (1622), f. 127r.

Salas emphasizes, above all, the pathos of disproportionate suffering: "No son buenos, pues pecan, ni malos, habiendo pecado con ignorancia... constituyendo pues a los semejantes en suprema grandeza y dignidad, si de

ella los miramos abatidos por pecado, que con ignorancia cometieron, es cosa clara que mueven los afectos de miedo y lástima" (Jusepe Antonio González de Salas, Nueva idea de la tragedia antigua, 1633, p. 44).

Even more marked was the chronological evolution of theoretical views on catharsis. While López Pinciano and Cascales adhered fairly closely to the traditional notion of an emotional crescendo "que aquieta el ánimo", Salas appears to have been in favour of a swing from Aristotelian/Senecan purgation, to Lopean perturbación: "Las tragedias juntamente aquietan y perturban el ánimo" (González de Salas, Nueva idea de la tragedia antigua, 1633, p. 13). In fact, there is evidence to suggest that, as the seventeenth century progressed, the kind of tragedies which Lope and his followers were producing were instrumental in creating an actual demand for tragic restraint. In the sixteenth century, theoretical purists like López Pinciano and theorist-playwrights like Juan de la Cueva were united in their belief that violent death was central to tragedy:

...en la tragedia mueren,  
un fin della esperando dolorido.

Juan de la Cueva, El viaje de Sannio (1585), f. 6r.

Muertes han de tener las finas tragedias y puras; y las que son mezcladas con lo cómico han de tener terrores y espantos y calamidades en el medio.

Alonso López Pinciano, Filosofía de antigua poética (1596), p. 349.

By the first years of the seventeenth century, however, some theorists were already beginning to omit this phenomenon from their definitions of tragedy: "La tragedia acaba en cosas tristes y lamentables habiendo al principio comenzado en cosas alegres y suaves" (Luis Alfonso de Cavallo, El cisne de Apolo, 1602, p. 24). Eventually, a few influential writers began to turn against Senecan modes in a way which implied a dawning realization of the subtler artistry involved in the Lopean "quiet tragedy": "Finalmente, no aciertan en la imitación de las tragedias los que tratan al pueblo como niño, representándole espantos, martirizando al teatro



con tramoyas, y todo para los ojos, sin que haya más que la corteza" (Francisco de Barreda, El mejor Príncipe Trajano Augusto, 1622, f. 125<sup>r</sup>).

### Developing Interpretations of "Imitation"

To my mind, the swing from Aristotelian to Lopean tragic criteria is most clearly indicated by the evolving interpretations, among the theorists, of the notion of verisimilitude. We have already seen that many of Lope's tragic plays appear to be based on a particularly literal understanding of the Aristotelian precept that art imitates life. This impression finds support in the Arte nuevo de hacer comedias:

[La comedia es] espejo  
de las costumbres, y una viva imagen  
de la verdad.  
El arte nuevo de hacer comedias, ed. Juana  
de José Prades (Madrid, 1971), 11.123-125.

The revolutionary nature of the idea that dramatic tragedy should embody the exact patterns and implications of real-life tragedy may be judged from López Pinciano's fundamentally abstract approach to the topic of artistic imitation:

¿Qué hace el zapatero, sastre, bonetero, calzetero, sino imitar y remedar al pie, pierna y cabeza del hombre?... Esto, pues, que la naturaleza y arte obran cuando remeda a las obras de otros, esto, digo, es dicha imitación.

Alonso López Pinciano, Filosofía de antigua poética (1596), p. 102.

That his "philosophical" interpretation of verisimilitude was to give way quite quickly to the concrete conception of life-likeness preached and practised by Lope, is evident from Cascales's definition of artistic imitation: "Así que nuestros hechos los imita la poética... las costumbres que imitamos son las costumbres de las personas" (Francisco de Cascales, Tablas poéticas, 1617, p. 29). The Lopean overtones of this statement are magnified by Salas, who suggests

that in tragedy especially a sense of emotional reality may be communicated by the kind of artistic imitation which includes an element of exaggeration:"¿Pinta el poeta al ávaro? Pues ha de figurar su avaricia, que en cierto modo exceda a su verdad"(González de Salas, Nueva idea de la tragedia antigua, 1633, p.74). A brief extract from a theoretical work written at the end of the seventeenth century will serve to support the argument that this element of artistic exaggeration was associated more with Lopean intensity than with Senecan vehemence, and that it continued to constitute a standard tragic precept even after Lope's death:

La comedia es semejantísima a la pintura.  
Pues si en una pequeña tabla se puede pintar  
toda la tierra, y aun también todo el cielo,  
¿por qué no se podrá representar en una  
breve comedia, que no exceda una o dos horas,  
toda la vida de Nerón?

José Alcazar, Ortografía castellana (ca.1690),  
cit. F. Sánchez Escribano and A. Porqueras Mayo,  
Preceptiva dramática española del Renacimiento  
y el Barroco (Madrid, 1965), p.238.

### Tragedy and Tragi-comedy

To sum up, it would seem that the revolutionary impact of Lope's tragic vision was such that it brought about changes even in the contemporary theory of tragedy. Its influence in this sphere seems to have shown itself most of all in the growing tendency to interpret tragic verisimilitude as concrete imitation of the patterns, conflicts and emotions of real-life tragedy. One corollary to these observations might well be that Lope's tragic theatre was essentially tragi-comic. Certainly, his contemporaries were increasingly inclined to defend the comedia (in a generic sense) on the grounds that it was life-like precisely because it refused to separate the tragic from the comic:"¿Por qué no se han de mezclar pasos alegres con los tristes, si los mezcla el cielo? ¿Esta comedia no es retrato de aquellas obras? Pues si es retrato, claro está que ha de referir su imagen"(Francisco de Barreda, El mejor Príncipe Trajano Augusto, 1622, f.124<sup>v</sup>). However,



F. Sánchez Escribano and A. Porqueras Mayo (Preceptiva dramática española del Renacimiento y el Barroco, Madrid, 1965) have already suggested that many of Lope's tragic works contain, in fact, few comic elements, and that the seventeenth century may have labelled them as "tragi-comedies" simply for want of a term applicable to plays which were "truly tragic" without being Aristotelian. This raises two questions: do the labels "tragedy" and "tragi-comedy" have for us implications which are different from those which they carried in the seventeenth century? If so, should we use the classifications most commonly employed by Lope's contemporaries, or the terminology of twentieth-century criticism?

Firstly, it is clear that we no longer associate tragi-comedy with a mixture of the high and the low, as Lope's contemporaries did. Tragedians like Arthur Miller, Bertold Brecht and Eugene O'Neill have shown us that, wherever else the "soul of tragedy" may lie, it certainly does not reside in stylistic grandeur or in the elevated social status of the tragic protagonist. Secondly, the unprecedented spate, in our century, of tragic definitions, has forced us to acknowledge not only the existence of many different kinds of tragedy, but also the possible lack of any one "tragic essence" common to them all. Consequently, we, unlike Lope's contemporaries, tend to be guided less by formalized theories than by personal, and even instinctive, judgements, in our assessments of what constitutes a tragedy, and what a tragi-comedy.

Of course, many would still consider dramatic purity - the Aristotelian unity of action which precludes any element extraneous to the tragic build-up - as a condition basic to the creation of tragic intensity.<sup>6</sup> However, my own feeling is that the opposing viewpoint carries greater conviction. Leo Aylen has pointed out that many of the world's most famous tragic masterpieces, including The Oresteia and Macbeth, contain comic and/or mundane elements, but that a denial of their status as "true tragedies" would nevertheless be unthinkable for most scholars.<sup>7</sup> His observations emphasize the necessity for arriving at a definition of the tragic which is flexible enough to be applied to tragedies of different



kinds, but precise enough to provide a means of distinguishing between "impure" tragedy and tragicomedy.

Judging from those tragedies which I have read, there is only one common denominator sufficiently invariable to constitute a "tragic essence": all of them - from Oedipus Rex to Othello to A View from the Bridge - finally bring the audience up against some formulation of the great "Cosmic Riddle". In some tragedies, Racine's Phèdre, for example, the overwhelming forces against which man pits his strength, emanate from the dark depths of human nature itself. In others, like King Lear and Mourning Becomes Electra, they are more obviously associated with external powers. Always, however, the tragic situation brings to the fore those big questions about man and his relationship with the cosmic forces which are alien to comedy because they can only be posed in absolute terms by death or acute suffering. It goes almost without saying that fear and pity (not necessarily cathartic in effect, but necessarily intense in evocation) are the emotional accompaniments of this intellectual tragic impact. Therefore, my criterion for distinguishing between an "impure" tragedy and a tragicomedy rests on the notion that a play ceases to be essentially tragic when its comic or mundane elements are sufficiently intrusive to detract from the cosmic intensity of its finale.

Applied to Lope's tragic theatre, this argument produces very mixed conclusions. A large number of his more sombre works obviously do qualify as tragicomedies. The double plots of El hermano honrado and El rey sin reino, for example, or the more-or-less equal mixture of tragic and comic substance in El caballero de Olmedo and Adonis y Venus, produce finales in which the emotional and intellectual impact of the catastrophe is lessened to some extent by an awareness of life's comic trivia as only temporarily eclipsed:

Callad, madre: no creáis  
que dejaréis los galanes,  
las ventanas, los favores,  
las joyas, los ricos trajes,  
los billetes y los celos.  
Adonis y Venus, Ac. VI, 32a.



However, there is a significant proportion of his tragic output which seems to me to be completely intense in its emotional impact, and utterly unadulterated in its cosmic implications. El castigo sin venganza, Los comendadores de Córdoba and La inocente sangre spring to mind at once, of course, as works in which there is little or nothing to detract from a taut and clear development of the tragic action. To these examples of Lope's "essential" tragedies, I would add more controversial plays like La desdichada Estefanía, Pedro Carbonero, El bastardo Mudarra and El Duque de Viseo. The non-tragic subplots and occasional moments of comedy in these works would probably have lead Lope's contemporaries to label them as tragicomedies. Many twentieth-century commentators might hesitate to apply the same classification, precisely because their ultimate impact is fully tragic. The sheer sense of waste at the end of Pedro Carbonero, for example, wipes out all memories of the Christian-Moorish jokes which have relieved the tragic tension at earlier stages. The catastrophic escalation in the latter half of El bastardo Mudarra is too rapid and intense to foster that impression of life's comic absurdity which arises from the trivial mishaps of the first act, and the mock-serious arguments in the peasant subplot of El Duque de Viseo are too closely related to the plays central tensions to impinge upon the extreme pathos and cosmic questioning of the finale: "Este ejemplo, caballeros, /os toca a todos" (El Duque de Viseo, ed. Francisco Ruiz Ramón, Madrid, 1966, p. 200).

Therefore, since our tragic criteria do tend to be more basic and less restricted than those of the seventeenth century, I have little hesitation in adopting twentieth-century terminology here, and in arguing that the majority of the plays mentioned in this study are not, in essence or effect, tragicomedies, but "impure" and revolutionary tragedies.<sup>8</sup>

#### The Conclusions as Applied to El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi

Superficially, El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi



would appear to be substantially unrepresentative of the Lopean tragic vision outlined here. It ends in a fairly violent manner, and its outright condemnation of the code of honour as the main cause of the catastrophe makes it less complex in overall conception than the majority of Lope's tragic plays. Clearly, these departures from the norm are due to the fact that in this play Lope is dealing directly with a social problem, in a way which is meant to imply that the issues at stake are not insoluble: "Mirad que el honor se cobra/de cualquier suerte que sea" (I.110-111). George Steiner has already pointed out that the paradox inherent in the notion of social tragedy is a crucial one, and it would be difficult to refute his contention that when there is a purely temporal solution to the central conflict, we are faced with serious drama rather than tragedy:

The tragic personage is broken by forces which can neither be fully understood nor overcome by rational prudence... More pliant divorce laws could not alter the fate of Agamemnon; social psychiatry is no answer to Oedipus. But saner economic relations or better plumbing can resolve some of the grave crises in the dramas of Ibsen.

George Steiner, The Death of Tragedy (London, 1961, p.8).

I would argue, however, that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi disproves Steiner's argument of the absolute impossibility of social tragedy, by forging a link between the temporal and the cosmic, and that its successful realization of the fusion shows that it is ultimately more representative of Lope's "impure" tragic vision than it appears, at first, to be.

Despite the emphasis which Lope lays on the man-made code of honour as the prime cause of the tragedy, and despite the potential solution pointed up by the rustics, there is, throughout the last act an increasing sense of innocence struggling against cosmic negligence and injustice. Lear's "Is there any cause in nature which makes these hard hearts?" reverberates through the Duchess's climatic confrontation with Julio (III.571-652), Otavio cries out "¡Ah, cielo! Pues ojos tienes, /



¿cómo no ves esto?"(III.991-992),and Amalfi's final vow of vengeance cannot but suggest that it is an apparent lack of cosmic justice which is responsible for the crude human substitute:

¡A todos os desafío,  
y a esta cruz la mano pongo,  
de no quitarla del lado...  
hasta que tome venganza!  
El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi,III.  
1013-1019.

The flaw in Steiner's argument is its failure to allow for the possibility that the social may,for a Christian dramatist particularly,be entangled with the cosmic,and the temporal solution dependent upon a return to Providential order.This is the case in our play.  
El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi does,in fact, conform to the general Lopean tragic vision in several significant respects:it emphasizes the innocence of the victims.It depicts wayward chance (the baby incident) as an intervening external force.It includes a comic subplot which is so woven into the tragic texture of the whole that it does not detract from the emotional intensity of the denouement,and it substitutes thought-provoking anxiety for catharsis.More importantly,however,its suggestion of an inter-relationship between social and cosmic injustice illustrates unmistakably that artistic purpose which seems to me to be most central of all to Lope's revolutionary tragic theatre:an exploration of the problems posed by the tragic experience in a real-life Christian context.

Footnotes to Chapter IV

1. See Alfredo Hermenegildo, Los trágicos españoles del siglo dieciséis (Madrid, 1961), and Edward M. Wilson and Duncan Moir, A Literary History of Spain. The Golden Age Drama, 1492-1700 (London and New York, 1971), 29-30, 54-55.
2. Duncan Moir, "The Classical Tradition in Spanish Dramatic Theory and Practice in the Seventeenth Century", in Classical Drama and its Influence: Essays Presented to H.D.F. Kitto, ed. M.J. Anderson (London, 1965), 191-228; Luis C. Pérez and F. Sánchez Escribano, Afirmaciones de Lope de Vega sobre preceptiva dramática a base de cien comedias (Madrid, 1961); J.W. Sage, Lope de Vega: El caballero de Olmedo (Grant and Cutler Ltd., 1974), 69-73.
3. C.D. Ley, "Lope de Vega y la tragedia", Clavileño, I (1950), 9-12; Arnold Reichenberger, "The Uniqueness of the Comedia", Hispanic Review, XXVII (1959), 303-316; A.A. Parker, "The Spanish Drama of the Golden Age: a Method of Analysis and Interpretation", in The Great Playwrights. Twenty-Five Plays with Commentaries by Critics and Scholars, ed. Eric Bentley (New York, 1970), I, 697-707; J.W. Sage, Lope de Vega: El caballero de Olmedo (Grant and Cutler Ltd., 1974).
4. See, for example, H.G. Halstead, "The Attitude of Lope de Vega Toward Astrology and Astronomy", Hispanic Review, VII (1939), 205-219; Otis H. Green, "Sobre las dos fortunas: de tejas arriba y de tejas abajo", in Studia philologica: homenaje a Dámaso Alonso, ed. A. Zamora Vicente (Madrid, 1961), 143-154; J.F. Montesinos, Estudios sobre Lope de Vega (Salamanca, 1967).
5. For an illuminating exposition of other aspects of



- this development see F. Sánchez Escribano and A. Porqueras Mayo, Preceptiva dramática española del Renacimiento y el Barroco (Madrid, 1965). Also relevant is Margarete Newels, Los géneros dramáticos en las poéticas del Siglo de Oro, trans. Amadeo Solé-Leris (London, 1974).
6. See, for example, Aldous Huxley, "Tragedy and the Whole Truth", Collected Essays (New York, 1958), 96-103.
  7. Leo Aylen, "The Vulgarly of Tragedy", in Classical Drama and Its Influence. Essays Presented to H.D.F. Kitto, ed. M.J. Anderson (London, 1965), 85-101.
  8. E.S. Morby's study helps to point up the lack of assurance which lay behind seventeenth-century classification of tragic plays: "Some Observations on tragedia and tragicomedia in Lope", Hispanic Review, XI (1943), 185-209.

## Chapter V

### The Social Background

El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi must have offered quite a tough challenge to some members of an audience in the very first years of the seventeenth century. By asking them to side with a couple who had defied the traditional cada uno en su esfera and casa con tu igual maxims, it assumed a willingness to reconsider social values which would have been virtually unquestionable one hundred and fifty years before. Bearing in mind the fact that a large number of Lope's other plays also focus on the controversial topics of the social climber and the mésalliance, the aim in this study will be to sketch the evolvement of real-life attitudes towards these unorthodox phenomena in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain. The subsequent chapter will explore the relationship between such developments in the social thought of the age, and some of Lope's class-centred plays.

It must be admitted from the outset that the final conclusions in this first study will be based more on comments made by sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spanish writers, than on the kind of solid statistical evidence which Lawrence Stone pinpoints as fundamental to the study of social evolution:

What the controversy did bring out more clearly than has ever been apparent before was the shoddy basis of much traditional historical methodology. Plausible rational grounds were found for quite contradictory hypotheses; since the proponent of each theory was free to choose his own evidence, and since there were too many individual facts pointing in too many different ways, this theorizing could not - and here demonstrably was not - being controlled by facts.

Social Change and Revolution in England, 1540-1640, ed. Lawrence Stone (London, 1965), p. xvi.



There is a sobering truth in this assertion that quotation from contemporary authors cannot take the place of facts and figures in providing a reliable yardstick with which to measure the extent of the social development which took place in any given period, and the power of the factors which brought it about. However, there is a point at which the study of the historical evolution of a society overlaps with the study of its literature, and here at least the documentation of changes in social ideology and attitudes may be of some relevance, providing that such evidence is taken in conjunction with the more factual conclusions furnished by historians.

#### The Results of Historical Research to Date

Several scholars have contributed to our knowledge of the upheavals which were actually taking place in the social hierarchy of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain.<sup>1</sup> From their studies emerge the following fundamental points:

1. The traditional concept of nobility persisted more or less unchanged until about the end of the fifteenth century. It was based on the ideal of a pedigree which reached back at least four generations, and on the notion that nobles were braver and more virtuous than commoners. It divided the aristocracy into three groups: a) títulos, who boasted a first-class lineage and a great deal of land and money; b) caballeros, who were of well-established family, but often less wealthy; c) hidalgos, who were possessors of a good ancestry, and usually of very little else.
2. This essentially blood-based concept of nobility first became confused at the end of the fifteenth century, due to the growth of an obsession with "clean blood" (i.e. untainted by Moorish or Jewish ancestry). This new kind of class distinction helped to blur the old social dividing lines to some extent, because it spread panic among noble families who had Jewish ancestors somewhere along the line, while giving to large numbers of "untainted" peasants a new sense of their own worth, and their right to some kind of honour.
3. At about this time too the nobility was losing

its prestige as a fighting force, while facing for the first time the prospect of large numbers of lower-class men infiltrating its ranks, on the strength of their bought hidalguías.

4. Although there had been, even before the start of the sixteenth century, isolated examples of educated underlings who had "worked their way up" with such success that either they, or their children, married into noble families, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw a steady increase in the number of men who used their education to better themselves socially.

All the facts, then, point clearly to the conclusion that the upstart, working and/or marrying his way out of his original social class, was one of the major symptoms of a rapidly evolving society, from the beginning of the sixteenth century onwards. What we now have to establish is how he was looked upon by his contemporaries. Is there evidence to suggest that the idea of bought nobility became gradually more acceptable as time went on? Was the status of the working man (the farmer, the merchant, the secretary...) promoted by the obsession with clean blood, the collapse of the noble's warrior image, and economic factors like the land crisis?<sup>2</sup> How long did it take for the concept of marriage-out-of-class to lose some of the stigma attached to it? To date, the majority of modern historians have emphasized the disapproval with which Spaniards in general, and the traditional nobility in particular, regarded the social climber, and there is certainly ample evidence to support their view of the situation.<sup>3</sup>

#### Conservative Attitudes: the Fifteenth Century

Those precepts of nobility which we have so far labelled as "traditional" were first set down in codified form by Alonso el Sabio. His central premise, "mayormente son nobles los que lo han por linaje y los que hacen buena vida" (Partida II, Título XXII, Ley II), is flexible enough to meet the practical needs of a king choosing his own nobility, according to the criteria raised by a fighting age. He agrees, for example, with



the classical notion that nobility may be conferred upon a man for his outstanding performances on the battlefield. However, he makes no allowances at all for the possibility of nobility without virtue or, more importantly here, for nobility without wealth: "que no sea caballero hombre muy pobre, si no le diere primeramente consejo él que lo hace, por que pueda bien vivir" (Partida II, Título XXI, Ley XII)<sup>4</sup>.

That this ancient conviction that good lineage engendered virtue, and therefore constituted nobility, continued as the foundation of formalized theories of nobility right up until the end of the fifteenth century, may be seen from works like Alonso de Cartagena's El doctrinal de los caballeros (1487), Enrique de Villena's Los doce trabajos de Hércules (1483), and Fernando de Mexía's El libro de la nobleza (1492). The latter treatise is particularly revealing of the rigid conception of nobility at this time, in that it qualifies Alfonso's support of ennoblement through bravery, by ruling that even the man promoted on this basis must not, himself, expect to enjoy fully recognized noble status: "hidalgo... no es aquél el cual es hecho nuevamente noble por el Príncipe, siendo de bajo y oscuro linaje... los sucesores de la dignidad como traspassen a la cuarta generación serán propiamente nobles" (El libro de la nobleza, II, xxxii).

It is true that Mosén Diego de Valera's Defensa de virtuosas mujeres (1440?) and a fifteenth-century Tratado de caballería supposedly written by Prince Don Carlos<sup>5</sup> bear testimony to a nascent awareness of the gulf between theory and practice insofar as the contemporary aristocratic life-style is concerned. Prince Don Carlos speaks regretfully of the loss of the old chivalresque ideals, and Diego de Valera makes an early protest against the materialistic trends growing up among the nobility: "Ya no curamos cuánto virtuoso sea el caballero, mas cuánto abundoso sea de riquezas; ya su cuidado que ser solía en cumplir grandes cosas, es convertida en pura avaricia" (Defensa de virtuosas mujeres, BAE, CXVI, 107a). However, like the other fifteenth-century theorists at hand, Valera and Don Carlos refrain



from making any specific mention of the problematic topics of "new nobles", bought hidalguías and loss of prestige among the aristocracy. Despite the fact that they are clearly aware of the crumbling moral façade of the contemporary nobility, these two theorists react to the prospect of social changes in what seems to be a typically fifteenth-century manner: by ignoring the concrete problems involved, and by taking an abstract and escapist trip back into the past:

Si por honra, la cual me hizo él que primero no era, y yo por pereza y mengua de corazón permaneceré en las cosas que primero hacía, y pasando a cosas más altas, y hecho singular por el Arco y Deviso militar, tornaré de las cosas más bajas, y no habré vergüenza de ensuciar la hermosura del oro con fea ganancia; no lo quiera Dios, Él me guarde de tal fealdad y vileza.

Tratado de caballería, Príncipe Don Carlos [?], f. 68<sup>v</sup>.

#### The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: the Conservatives Develop Their Arguments

The passage quoted above is, of course, an extreme example of the negative attitude towards social change. However, the same kind of antagonistic sentiments continued to find frequent expression throughout the sixteenth and well into the seventeenth century, with vague complaints about greed and loss of altruistic ideals gradually giving way to solid arguments, and a steady crystallization of the case against the social climber. Antonio de Guevara, writing in 1526, to Mosén Rubén Valenciano, seems to have been one of the first to rationalize on paper his dislike of the nobility-through-riches trend: "porque comida la hacienda dad por acabada su caballería. En el estado en que los hombres ganan de comer, en aquel se debían conservar" (Epístolas familiares, 1578, p. 327). The argument that only those who had been reared in the noble style were sophisticated enough to live in a gracious fashion without running themselves into bankruptcy was one which the conservative faction was to bring out with increasing frequency towards the end of the century,



in an attempt to counteract the charge that the rich bourgeois's money-making activities were, in fact, meritorious, because socially beneficial. However, it is unusual to find such an earth-bound criticism of the social climber at this early date. Throughout the sixteenth century protests against the upstart were commonly based less on practical considerations, than on the notion that his aspirations ran counter to the "scale of nature", the universal hierarchy in which each man was appointed to his place by God.

The need to maintain at least the appearance of this universal ordering leads Melchior de Santa Cruz y Dueñas to advise the prosperous bourgeois not to stop making money, but to hide the signs of his affluence:

Tengan honesta pasada,  
mediana casa y criados,  
y aderezos no sobrados.  
Libro de los cien tratados (1576), f.30<sup>r</sup>.

The same firm belief in social degree as a reflection of cosmic order would seem to explain why some moralists, even in the sixteenth century, disapproved of the upstart's tendency to dress up in noble fashion, strongly enough to speak of it as a moral crime:

Pues no menos delito es vestirse un hombre vulgar toda la hacienda que tiene, para confundir la policía de la república y robar la autoridad de los principales della, que cometer otros delitos que se castigan ...que de verse los plebeyos y hombres llanos tan aderezados como los caballeros y señores, compiten con ellos, diciendo que no les deben nada, y tan buena capa traen como ellos.

Pedro de Mercado, Diálogos de filosofía natural y moral (1574), ff.135r-135v.

This hatred - disproportionate to us - of the individual who dressed above his class, should clearly be linked with the various laws which were passed in the sixteenth century, restricting the wearing of silk, for example, to men and women of the more prestigious classes.<sup>6</sup> The fact that the Cortes should have felt compelled to try and

prevent any widespread aping of aristocratic fashions at this particular stage, confirms the impression that the sixteenth-century upstart could not have justified himself on economic grounds alone; he was faced, first and foremost, with the charge of having violated "natural law".

To a certain extent, of course, the same is true of seventeenth-century objections to the social climber. Moralists like Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa (El pasajero, 1617) and Antonio Marqués (Afeite y mundo mujeril, 1617) continued to inveigh against the "unnatural" spectacle presented by the plebeian dressed in the dandy's clothing. However, a brief extract from the latter work will show how such criticisms now tended to be mixed with other, more practical, arguments against the upstart:

Y es ordinario que en viendo a un hombre bien vestido, lo estima el mundo por otro de lo que es, en tal manera que la azada del labrador, el trinchete del zapatero, la carda del peragre, el pujavante del herrador se cubren hoy día con una buena capa, para no ser conocidos de su propio padre.

Afeite y mundo mujeril (1617), ed. F. Rubio, pp. 39-40.

A man's clothing is here taken as symbolic of his trade, more than as a sign of his lineage, and although the two concepts are linked, the shift in emphasis is significant. The land crisis had already brought about a more general awareness of the threat to the economy posed by the rich peasant who retired from his trade,<sup>7</sup> and it seems that by the last third of the sixteenth century some were beginning to realize that holders of other oficios viles also had it in their power to affect the national finances, simply by changing their jobs: "en España no hay tan singulares artífices en todas artes y ciencias, ni tan ricos como los habría si cada uno quisiese perseverar en el arte que comenzó, o los padres hiciesen a sus hijos de sus artes o oficios" (Bartolomé de Albornoz, Arte de los contractos, 1573, f. 128<sup>v</sup>). It is not, therefore, surprising, that as the seventeenth century progressed, the enemies of the social climber tended to base their case less on the fundamental, but abstract, "scale of nature" argument, which had characterized



sixteenth-century criticisms, than on practical considerations, like that of a potential labour shortage resulting from the widespread readiness to abandon "dishonourable" but socially vital trades.

Of course, the increasingly popular catchphrase, ¿El más vil oficio del mundo? La ociosidad, was one which could - and did - cut in two directions, since it could be applied to the gentleman of leisure, as much as to the ambitious social climber. Nevertheless, it is clear that by the mid-seventeenth century, if not before, the social climber had acquired a reputation for vulgarity and lack of savoir-faire which was directly connected with his disinclination to occupy for life a lucrative but humble position. We have already noted that in the early years of the sixteenth century there was a budding image of the upstart as a gauche individual, whose lack of polish made his social pretensions ridiculous, and it seems that by 1635, this concept had become so entangled with the notion of a man's prosperity as reliant on his unswerving devotion to a single trade, that one of Ambrosio de Salazar's sophisticated jokes needed to do no more than hint at the abandonment of trade idea, for the picture of a foolish and pretentious bourgeois to spring to mind: "En la ciudad de Burdeos hubo un mercader el cual tenía un hijo algo travieso... lo envió a Alemania, donde se hizo un gran maestro de beber, y no quiso más ser mercader" (Libro curioso, 1635, pp. 45-46). Similarly, although he does not deal directly with the topic of the self-made man, Salas Barbadillo, writing in 1620, puts a tacit stamp of disapproval on the ambitious nouveau riche. His work, El caballero perfecto, suggests that the true aristocrat is he whose innate virtue and gentle upbringing have always encouraged him to prize manners above money, and to accept graciously a social position of secondary prestige: "Por ser en su casa el segundo [sus padres] le establecieron el mayorazgo en la virtuosa crianza, más firme que en la fortuna... Era cortés con iguales e inferiores y aunque no rico, tan liberal de lo que tenía, que nunca pareció pobre" (El caballero perfecto, 1620, ed. P. Marshall, p. 6).



Salas Barbadillo's didactic novel shows that the traditional, idealistic vision of nobility, with all the rigid social stratification which it implied, was still being propagated by some well into the seventeenth century. Consequently, it must be assumed that even at this stage the phenomenon of social climbing would still have been associated, to some extent, with notions of ugly materialism, ungodly conventions of "natural law", boorish unsophistication, and the ruination of the national economy. However, there is a brighter side to the picture, and it seems to me that historians to date have not emphasized sufficiently those currents of thought which went with the social climber, and against his conservative enemies in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain. To begin with, scholars of comparative European history generally conclude that, while the social changes which have been outlined here were taking place all over Europe during this period, other countries were quicker to accept them than Spain was.<sup>8</sup> This, I think, is debatable, and, although it is not possible to make a full comparative survey here, a brief glance at some of the attitudes towards social change in England, France and Italy may help to put Spanish objections to the social climber into perspective.

#### Social Climbing as a European Phenomenon

Much of the material to be presented in this section has been culled at second hand from various scholars who specialize in the social history of the countries concerned.<sup>9</sup> Difficulties arise from the fact that, while there is a bewildering mass of information on, and interpretation of, social change in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England, there has been insufficient research into this period in France and Italy. Nevertheless, I think that there is a more reliable picture to be built up from the accounts of these specialists, taken together, than from comparative histories like those mentioned previously.

First of all, the specialists make it clear that all over Europe at this time, the traditional nobility were dismayed and alarmed at the prospect of being invaded by armies of wealthy plebeians, and that they made all



the objections to the upstart, as an unhealthy social phenomenon, which we have noted among the conservative faction in Spain. The pattern in England and Italy appears to have differed slightly from that which can be traced in Spain, in that, according to Lawrence Stone and Peter Burke, social mobility was greater in the sixteenth than in the seventeenth century in these countries.<sup>10</sup> France also varied from Spain in one important respect which has been thoroughly documented by Davis Bitton: it produced a spate of open, and sometimes vitriolic, attacks on the traditional ideals and contemporary vices of the nobility.<sup>11</sup> Taken in the round, however, it would appear from the work of these scholars that little justification can be found for the traditional assumption that attitudes towards social change were more progressive in other European countries than they were in Spain.

In point of fact, judging from my own reading of contemporary social commentaries written in countries other than Spain, it seems possible that, in some areas of the social-climbing topic, Spaniards may have been quicker than others to question traditional notions, or, at least, more reasoned than others in their criticisms of what was new. Certainly, there is evidence to suggest that Italian theorists of nobility, for example, went on inveighing heavily against the aristocracy-through-riches notion, long after most of their Spanish counterparts had begun to treat the topic in a less emotive, and more open-minded way: "Questi sono i nobili moderni...che senza dignità dei loro antecessori...con tre stara di fava...con una colombara da passere edificata novamente...si dipingono al mondo per nobili...essendo mera canaglia (T. Garzoni, La piazza universale, 1615, f. 78<sup>r</sup>).<sup>12</sup>

Similarly, although A. L. Rowse suggests that in England the social climber was at no point without partisans, the most famous and influential English theorist of this period is more dogmatic than any contemporary Spaniard known to me, in his attack on the wealthy new nobles: "Neither must we honour or esteem those ennobled or made gentle in blood who, by mechanic and base means, have raked up a mass of wealth...or purchased an ill coat at a good rate" (Henry Peacham,



The Complete Nobleman, 1622, p. 3). Even in the sixteenth century, at the time when England is supposed to have been at her most liberal, and Spain at her most rigid, some Spanish commentators seem to have been less inflammable than some English writers, particularly in their criticisms of the man who rose through commerce. A good example of the English tendency to rhetorical vehemence on this subject is provided by Lawrence Humfrey's complaints about those who better themselves "by force... or fraud... as basest of obscurest misers":

Let such as are drunken and reel with the  
meed of new honour and forget the dunghill  
whence by God they were raised to the type  
of honour, call to mind their father's coat,  
and first homely cradles, and be not ashamed  
of the baseness of their birth.

Lawrence Humfrey, The Nobles, 1563, f. 14<sup>r</sup>.

Unfortunately, Humfrey does not specify exactly who these forceful, fraudulent and miserly persons are. However, we can gather from one of Santa Cruz's merchant jokes that popular humour attributed to business men of all kinds (merchants, usurers, bankers...) these same qualities of shamelessness and greed: "Decía Hernando de Pulgar que para enriquecer uno en breve tiempo que eran menester dos pocos y dos muchos: poca vergüenza y poca conciencia, mucha codicia y mucha diligencia" (Melchor de Santa Cruz y Dueñas, Floresta española, 1574, ed. Hernán López de Yanguas, p. 138). The chief difference between these two sixteenth-century criticisms of the rich bourgeois is that the Spanish one is more fair-minded than the English. Santa Cruz does at least admit that the new man is helped on, not just by "the grace of God", but by his own hard work.

It is clear from Davis Bitton's work that during this period in France the "idle noble" was the central figure of a heated debate, in which both the traditional and neoteric viewpoints were given frequent airings. However, bearing in mind the facts that the lion's share of lucrative offices continued to go to nobles rather than to better-educated commoners, throughout the period we are studying, and that the rule of dérogance



Kept merchants and aristocrats poles apart (in theory at least), until the mid-seventeenth century, it would seem that the French questioning of established criteria of nobility did not have as a major side-effect the promotion of the new noble's status, as I think the same questioning did in Spain. A similar kind of non-productive social criticism seems to have been characteristic of the state of Venice in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Cushman Davis points out that Venice was something of an exception to the rest of Italy, in that its aristocratic circles were totally closed to even the richest of plebeians. Despite repeated protests and one actual revolt, furthermore, the minor nobility of this city state were barred from positions of political importance, and even in the eighteenth century Battista Nani's public declaration that "offices of the Republic should not be birthrights so much as rewards for ability" was apparently considered revolutionary.<sup>13</sup> It would be unfair to push the exceptionally backward attitudes of Venice beyond the limits of their due importance in a comparative survey. However, when evaluating the traditional assumption that the development of social ideology was slower in Spain than anywhere else in Europe, it is as well to remember that it was Venice, not Spain, which eventually ran out of noble administrators, through having repeatedly refused to replenish the numbers of the established aristocracy with new men drawn from the bourgeoisie.

As one last indication of the possibility that Spain was positively in advance of some European countries insofar as some aspects of the social-climbing issue were concerned, it should be pointed out that Spaniards seem to have been relatively quick to take the part of the man who rose from his social class by means of learning. As far as I can ascertain, the education = virtue = nobility argument was first emphasized by Italian theorists. B. Castiglione's Il cortegiano (1528) seems to have started the trend by pointing out the need for a high standard of education among the aristocracy: "Il nostro cortegiano...che nelle lettere sia più che mediocrementemente erudito" (f. 21<sup>r</sup>). Others then



took up the notion which had, by the last third of the sixteenth century, been pushed a logical step further: "Da questo io mi muovo a dire che meritano grande honore quelli che da basso luogo con la scala delle proprie virtù ascendono a riguardevole altezza, come fecero alcuni pontefici...non meno s'accresce la nobiltà con la virtù delle lettere, che con quella delle arme" (Stefano Guazzo, La conversazione civile, 1574, f. 93<sup>v</sup>). We shall see in the next section that this kind of support for the man whose claim to social promotion rested on his brains and education, also became quite common in Spain from about 1580 onwards. It would seem that the same cannot be said of France, and possibly not of England either.

There is some disagreement among modern historians about the extent to which educated commoners in England were moving into the kind of responsible administrative offices traditionally reserved for noblemen. However, a weighing up of the conflicting evidence offered by the leaders of the debate, would suggest that this was not happening to a significant degree until the first years of the seventeenth century.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, although the standard manual for "gentleman retainers", Angel Day's The English Secretary (1586), does, like its Spanish equivalents, stress the utterly respectable image of the secretary and his kind, Louis B. Wright brings forward solid evidence to support his claim that, by the early seventeenth century, there had been a substantial drop in both the number of well-educated servants employed by aristocratic households, and the degree of esteem in which they were held ("A Conduct Book for Malvollio", Studies in Philology, XXXI (1934), 115-132). Clearly, dogmatic conclusions would be unjustified here, but it does seem possible that, between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the non-noble man of letters may have had more encouragement, and more access to prestigious careers in Spain than in England.

We are on firmer ground in arguing that Frenchmen tended to put a lower value than Spaniards on the educated underling and, indeed, on learning as an activity. To begin with, we have Davis Bitton's documentation of



the anti-plebeian trends prevalent amongst those who were responsible for choosing office-holders in France. Also, several Spanish and Italian writers of the sixteenth century bear testimony to the fact that Frenchmen were noted for their contempt of intellectual pursuits: "Questo è uno degli abusi in molti paesi, e particolarmente della Francia, dove sono tanto poco stimulate le lettere" (Stefano Guazzo, La conversazione civile, 1574, f.231<sup>r</sup>). More significantly, perhaps, one French noble was protesting, as late as 1632, against the culturally detrimental persistence of the nobleman-warrior image in France:

Il me semble qu'il n'y a point d'occupation plus honnête ni plus essentielle à un gentilhomme que celle des armes...il est certain, cependant, que le nombre n'est pas petit dans la cour de ces esprits mal-faits...qui ne peuvent se figurer qu'un gentilhomme puisse être savant et soldat ensemble.

Nicolas Faret, L'Honnête homme ou l'art de plaire à cour (1632), pp.14-15.

Having argued, then, that Spain's comparatively early acceptance of the man who used his education to better himself probably constituted one of her main claims to social "progressiveness", as judged by general European criteria, it would be appropriate now to outline the ways in which Spanish attitudes towards this kind of social climbing developed between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

#### The Learned Upstart and His First Ascetic Image

Once again we have probably to acknowledge here the revolutionary influence of Castiglione's Il cortegiano. Translated in 1534 by Juan Boscán it seems to have forged the first strong link between nobility and learning in Spain. The fifteenth-century theorists of nobility had emphasized the notion that the battlefield - not the library - was the noble's natural environment, but by the end of the sixteenth century Castiglione's learning-virtue-nobility notion had

inveigled its way into the standard Spanish teachings on nobility. One anonymous and very orthodox theorist of this period includes in his analysis of aristocratic virtue two of those qualities which were associated more with the man of letters than with the warrior: "La primera parte del noble es ser principal. El valor de la propia persona, en prudencia, en justicia, en ánimo y valentía..." (Tratado de nobleza, 1595, MS. 12598, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, f. 27<sup>r</sup>). Furthermore, there is reason to suppose that even before this date the notion of learning as an actual source of nobility was gaining ground in Spain. Téllez de Meneses, writing before 1570, points out that "las dignidades concedidas por los reyes han sido por virtudes que en sus súbditos han conocido, claridad, ciencia y hechos de armas que en ellos se han hallado" (Téllez de Meneses, El lucero de la nobleza, f. 6<sup>r</sup>).<sup>15</sup>

Of course, Téllez's statement that history provides examples of noble status attained through letters as well as through arms, does not amount to a concrete defence of the learned upstart as a contemporary social reality. Neither does Juan de Espinosa's enthusiastic but somewhat vague praise of the low-born academic celebrity:

¿Cuántos, por otra parte, de humildísimo linaje, con su virtud y valor se han hecho ilustres? Si te contase... los varones que entre los oradores, poetas y filósofos, entre los capitanes y reyes... fueron de bajo lugar y obscurísimo linaje, que después, por su ingenio y doctrina, por sus hazañas y virtudes, vinieron a ser ilustres, maravillarte has.

Juan de Espinosa, Diálogo en laude de las mujeres (1580), ed. A. González Simón, p. 56.

Both writers restrict themselves carefully to the past tense, and offer illustrations of the learned upstart (orators, philosophers, popes...) which smack more of the golden days when knowledge was a vocation, than of the contemporary situation in which lawyers, administrative officers, secretaries and the like were putting their education to more practical uses, for more materialistic purposes. It is easy to imagine the meteoric rise of



the romantic Juan Latino, for example, adding fuel to Espinosa's eulogistic fire, but the less ascetic figure cut by the low-born Secretary of State, Francisco de los Cobos, does not match up so well with the sixteenth-century picture of the "pure scholar".<sup>16</sup> The learning-virtue-nobility idea had succeeded in breaking down, to some extent, the old noble-warrior image, and in paving the way for more concrete defences of the educated upstart. Unfortunately, it had also been instrumental in propagating a rarified image of the man of letters which did not correspond with the contemporary facts of life.

### The Learned Upstart as a Social Reality

There is evidence to suggest that those commentators of the period who were, themselves, aware of the discrepancy between the popular image of the educated underling, and the social realities represented by the scholar-profiteer, were sometimes inclined to disapprove of it. Juan de Arce y Otalora, for example, complains that education in the new, practical style, is responsible for bringing about a violent swing towards bureaucracy which cannot but decrease Spain's agricultural and manual labour forces: "No quiero yo decir que no había de haber oficios, sino que no había de haber tantos oficiales, que son causa de inventar en el mundo mil invenciones y gastos superfluos y sin provecho" (Juan de Arce y Otalora, Diálogos familiares sobre las letras y ciencias, 2 vols, II, f. 15<sup>v</sup>).<sup>17</sup> With more vehemence and less cogency Pedro de Mercado argues that the concept of learning is itself debased when directed towards practical ends, and that the results of this debasement are to be seen in the affected manners and superficial knowledge of the contemporary letrado:

Finalmente parece otro linaje de hombres que los comunes, y verlos muy echamarrados y graves, la gorra empinada, los pasos muy a compás, y todo esto con tanto cuidado que si algo se descuidan dello creen de sí que no son letrados ... apenas ha uno arrebatado dos o tres años de estudio, como si se soltase de cadenas, quiere ganarlo todo, y representar que todo lo sabe...

y lo que les falta de letras, súplenlo con una parlera eloquencia...

Pedro de Mercado, Diálogos de filosofía natural y moral (1574), ff. 130r-130v.

Even in the seventeenth century that unrecanting snob, Salas Barbadillo, was drawing the kind of distinction between aesthetic and practical scholarship which resulted in the devaluation of the latter. Witness the preliminary dialogue of his Casa del placer honesto: "El haber estudiado para saber... loable ha sido... mas ... si nosotros ocupamos este campo, ¿qué dejamos libre a las acciones de los que nacieron sin ricas posesiones, herencias de sus antepasados, como las nuestras? Sigán ellos el cautiverio de sus miserables hados, y gocemos nosotros... la dulce libertad" (La casa del placer honesto, 1602, f. 1<sup>v</sup>). Clearly, the growing realization that the learned upstart as he figured in contemporary society was rather different from his "pure scholar" ancestors, did not always increase his popularity. However, I have found that during the last years of the sixteenth, and the first years of the seventeenth, centuries, attacks on the contemporary scholar-profiteer seem to have been less frequent than indications of an increasing respect for the concepts which he represented.

Juan Benito Guardiola's Tratado de nobleza, for example, furnishes concrete evidence of the movement towards a more up-to-date interpretation of the old, low-born-but-meritorious scholar idea: "Los que por letras y ciencia han subido a gran estado y fama, como quiera que fuesen de muy bajo suelo y linaje, no debieron ser en menos tenidos y reputados que los que se jactan y vanaglorian que descienden de nobles e ilustres padres" (Tratado de nobleza, 1591, f. 39<sup>r</sup>). That Guardiola's willing acceptance of the educated upstart as a contemporary reality reflected a general trend, rather than a freakish minority viewpoint, may be surmised from a treatise written by Pedro Sáenz de Varrón sometime in the first half of the seventeenth century.<sup>18</sup> This writer claims that it was a contemporary custom for university graduates - some of whom would, presumably, be moving up the social scale to posts of



administrative responsibility - to receive a ring and a spur made of gold "en señal de hidalguía" (f. 43<sup>v</sup>). He himself is in full agreement with this practical application of the nobility-through-learning principle: "Ya que con muy justo título y razón merecen estos tales ser honrados y tenidos por nobles, viendo las mercedes, prerogativas y privilegios que les son concedidos" (f. 44<sup>r</sup>). Exactly how effective such a symbolic ennoblement would have been in increasing the respect with which lawyers, secretaries and civil servants were actually treated is, of course, a moot point. The fact that other theorists of nobility do not mention the custom might lead some to suspect that it was either less widespread than Sáenz de Varrón implies, or else more commonly regarded as a ceremonial gesture of little social significance. However, the fact remains that our informant here accords his own enthusiastic support to the contemporary scholar-profiteer, and joins with others in leading us to suppose that, because the idea of learning directed towards practical ends was rapidly becoming respectable at the end of the century, certain kinds of learned upstarts were early candidates for social acceptability.

The Secretary, the Administrative Officer, the Senior Clerk

One of the clearest signs of the growing appreciation of the higher civil servant and his kind, lies in the fact that even the social commentators who disapproved of the general bureaucratic trends of the age were increasingly inclined to admit that some administrative officials were performing a demanding and necessary task. We have already noted, for example, that Arce y Otalora basically believed that Spain should bolster up her agricultural, rather than her bureaucratic, work-force. However, even he shows some recognition of the greater administrative needs of the seventeenth century, in allowing that, since each man has different talents to offer, and since some state offices are

essential to the smooth-running of the country, it would be unfair to classify the contemporary man of letters as less worthy and useful, in general terms, than the farmer: "Todos son menester, pues todos ganan de comer... Dios hizo los hombres... inclinados a diversas operaciones, unos a mandar y gobernar con el entendimiento, y otros para obrar con las manos en diversos oficios" (Juan de Arce y Otalora, Diálogos familiares sobre las letras y ciencias, f. 16<sup>v</sup>)<sup>17</sup>.

More wholeheartedly, even though writing at an earlier date, Antonio de Torquemada lists among his "truly honourable men", "los virtuosos, los sabios, los que tienen dignidades o oficios honrados públicos... (Los coloquios satíricos, 1584, f. 134<sup>v</sup>). His praise is encouraging because it indicates a more positive re-evaluation than any we have seen so far, of the social contribution made by the white-collar worker. Not surprisingly, this recognition of the usefulness and dignity of the man who held a public office was soon to be followed by the notion that the occupation of such a post was, in itself, an ennobling activity: "Lo cuarto que hace al hombre ser estimado es tener alguna dignidad o oficio honroso" (Tratado de nobleza, anon., 1595, MS. 12598, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, f. 30<sup>r</sup>). There can be little doubt, then, that by the end of the sixteenth century bureaucrats employed by the state enjoyed a great deal of respect; so much so, in fact, that the educated plebeian who managed to join their number was regarded by some as having thoroughly deserved his social promotion.

Clearly, the figure of the higher civil servant must have been linked, to a large extent, with that of the secretary. The two callings necessitated the same kind of scholastic qualifications and - according to Domínguez Ortiz and Juan Beneyto - attracted the same kind of lesser noblemen and well-educated bourgeois. However, the prime distinction is that the secretary was a private employee. Therefore, he was less obviously at the service of the "Republic" than his state-employed colleagues, and while their social status would have depended upon the level at which they



entered the bureaucratic network and the progress which they made within it, the private secretary's prestige must have been determined for once and for all by his master's social standing, with little possibility of further promotion without a change of employer. For example, the famous rise of Francisco de los Cobos should surely be regarded as a classic example of the heights which could be attained by the senior civil servant, rather than those within the reach of the private secretary, because Cobos moved steadily up the ladder of a structured, state-directed organization, as a gentleman's personal secretary could not. This leads one to suspect that a Spaniard of this period might have been quicker to associate the ambitious man of letters with the idea of an oficio público than with that of a private secretaryship. However, it is clear that what the secretary - and other educated servants, like the mayordomo and the camarero - lost in long-term career prospects and "public beneficiary" connotations, they gained in immediate power, and in close personal contact with their social superiors.

Satirical joke books of the kind compiled by Melchor de Santa Cruz y Dueñas and Ambrosio Salazar frequently portray the mayordomo as a powerful household tyrant, and Yelgo de Bázquez's Estilo de servir a príncipes emphasizes the everyday contiguity of the oficial de casa to his aristocratic employers: "Ha de acudir muy de ordinario a la sala y antecámara y cámara, así de la señora, como del señor" (Yelgo de Bázquez, El estilo de servir a príncipes, 1614, p. 33). Even more indicative of a tendency to regard the gap between the educated servant and his noble master as one which could - on occasion - be bridged, is Barrio Angulo's portrait of the secretary as moral counsellor:

Diamante ha de ser el secretario en la fineza y perfección de su señor, mostrando vigor y prudencia en apurar y discernir lo útil y provechoso de lo dañoso y perjudicial... los ánimos de los señores no se han de disponer a usar de su poder y libertad, ni a mudar las velas según los vientos y la variedad de la fortuna: sino a que se midan y ajusten con la razón.

Gabriel Pérez del Barrio Angulo, Dirección de secretarios de señores (1613), f. 13r.



This advice is, of course, heavily laced with reminders of the need for such guidance to be offered with all due respect and secretarial diplomacy, but the implication of the learned servant's prestigious standing and personal power is there. Furthermore, in the introduction to his work, Barrio suggests that secretarial status - despite all the hard work and tribulations which it brings - is in demand, precisely because it is an oficio honrado: "Estos oficios son de calidad... así algunos de los que llegan a servir este ministerio, van contando cuidado de la conservación, y tan acompañados de una ambición de honra que los más pican en el codo de la adulación" (f. 1<sup>v</sup>). The intimation of the secretaryship as a socially elevating post is echoed by an Italian commentator, who claims that this kind of private administrative career has in Spain the same connotations of honour and advancement as the profession of arms: "Los españoles no se dedican al comercio, considerándolo vergonzoso... se dedican con preferencia a las armas, con escasos recursos, o a servir a algún grande, con mil trabajos y miserias" (Francisco Guicciardini, Relación de España, 1512-1513, ed. Antonio María Fabiá, Madrid, 1879, p. 68).

It should be borne in mind that this evidence of the high social standing of the secretary and his kind has to be regarded, to some degree, as suspect: Guicciardini's generalization because it is based on the - possibly superficial - impressions of a foreigner, and the observations of Barrio and Bázquez because they are taken from works written for secretaries, by secretaries. However, I think we might be justified in concluding that the image of the private secretary was sufficiently allied, in concepts of assiduity, trained intelligence and authority, to that of the state-employed letrado, for defences of the utility and honourableness of the contemporary scholar-profitour to be regarded as applicable to both. This being so, Moreno de Vargas's championship of the plebeian whose claim to social prominence rests on his gift for management and administration, must have had important



and encouraging implications for quite a large sector of those who were striving for an increase in social recognition:

No sólo entre los nobles,mas también entre los ignobles,han de ser preferidos los que fueren ricos,siendo igualmente por sus personas capaces para el gobierno de la República:porque de manera que a ellos son preferidos y antepuestos los nobles,así también lo deben ser los ricos entre los plebeyos,porque se reputan por casi nobles, o constituidos en dignidad...y pienso que adonde hubiere hidalgos tan pobres que no tengan la cantidad de hacienda necesaria para obtener los oficios de la República, y no hubiere otros hidalgos que la tengan, se han de dar los oficios a los que,sin ser hidalgos,fueren ricos,por las razones referidas.

Bernarbé Moreno de Vargas,Discursos de la nobleza(1622),f.50r.

This theorist does not,of course,reject the fundamental tenets of traditional teachings on nobility; he states firmly that the rich noble is still to be preferred to the rich plebeian.However,in recognizing that there is more potential for efficient administration in the rich commoner than in the poor aristocrat, and in arguing that the former's greater capacity for social authority almost puts him on a par with the traditional nobility,Moreno de Vargas is only one step away from saying that the bourgeois scholar-profiteer has every right to take a place in the circles of the established aristocracy.

#### Doctors and Lawyers

One might expect to find that the growing respect for educated commoners who took up clerical and administrative posts was extended also to non-noble practitioners of the legal and medical professions.After all, we know that many respectable bourgeois did undergo scholastic training for these jobs,and it would appear from Ruth Pike's Aristocrats and Traders;Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century (Cornell,1972,p.74)

that this southern port boasted a petty nobility which consisted largely of affluent lawyers. However, judging from what I have read, doctors and lawyers had to contend throughout this period with more prejudice than other letrados, in their struggle for social recognition. It is true, of course, that the legal and medical callings have always been prime targets for social satire. The traditional system of direct payment, and the inevitable tendency for failures on the part of their practitioners to be disastrously evident, seem to have made them particularly vulnerable, and certainly, in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain the concepts of the killer doctor and the opportunist lawyer figured prominently in social satires of the kind written by Quevedo.

In addition to these traditional slurs, Spanish doctors and lawyers had to fight against the underlying and widespread notion that "selfless" activities like healing and the administration of justice should be performed on a vocational, rather than a gainful, basis: "Bien sería si los médicos de ahora fuesen como los de los tiempos pasados...que hablaban a su seguro, y sin necesidad de ganar de comer por su trabajo" (Antonio de Torquemada, Los coloquios satíricos, 1584, f. 56<sup>v</sup>). On the whole, it would seem that the lawyer was less harshly criticized than his medical colleague. The sophisticated nature of his trade lead to frequent assertions of his dishonesty, of course: "Dejo lo que toca a los abogados, pues se sabe que si se cercenan las bobas a los pobres, las deguellan del todo a los ricos, oprimiendo la fuerza de lo justo, con el parecer más debilitado, y encareciendo sumamente la mercaduría de sus palabras y el subsidio de sus lenguas" (Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, Plaza universal de todas ciencias y artes, 1615, f. 40<sup>r</sup>). However, the blanket term abogado covered a host of professional men (notaries, jurists, procuradores, bailiffs...), some of whom would undoubtedly have been linked in the popular mind with the more admired "public official", and it seems that there was, towards the end of the sixteenth century, a nascent realization of the great learning and assiduity expected of the lawyer: "Los casos que se os ofrecen á los abogados son tan diferentes que



cada uno requiere nuevo estudio" (Pedro de Mercado, Diálogos de filosofía natural y moral, 1574, f. 107<sup>v</sup>). In fact, by the first years of the seventeenth century, even the anti-bourgeois Salas Barbadillo was ready to hint that the legal profession as a whole was worthy of greater recognition: "siendo una gente que se ocupa en trabajar para el gusto del vulgo" (La casa del placer honesto, 1602, f. 3<sup>v</sup>). In view of this move towards a re-assessment of the lawyer's contribution, it is not surprising that, in speaking of the honourable jobs open to plebeians, Arce y Otalora should suggest that the legal profession was potentially more ennobling than many: "En esto no hay que disputar, que común opinión es que el doctor teológico se prefiere al jurista, y el jurista al médico... y después de ellos se prefieren a los filósofos y artistas y oficiales mecánicos" (Diálogos familiares sobre las letras y ciencias, II, f. 64<sup>v</sup>).<sup>17</sup>

Doctors differed from lawyers, of course, in that they worked with their hands and were therefore more liable to be classified as holders of dishonourable oficios mecánicos. Also, many of them were cristianos nuevos,<sup>19</sup> a fact which may help to explain why Luis Rufo, for example, hinges several of his jokes around avarice as a typical trait of the medical man: "Viniendo un médico a visitar a las doce dadas, le pidió un amigo suyo cuatro reales prestados, el cual afirmó que no los tenía, y le dijo, 'O sois médico desvalido, o amigo desaprovechado'" (Las quinientas apotegmas, 1600, no. 179). The most frequent and serious complaint of all was that the doctor, more than any other contemporary letrado, had an inadequate grounding in his art. Arce y Otalora actually says that university courses in medicine were shorter than those in other subjects. I have been unable to discover whether this was, in fact, the case, but certainly other examples could be given of his accusation that too many contemporary doctors are lacking in knowledge and experience: "Gran lástima es de un letrado, que a trece o catorce años de estudio no ose hacer un escrito sobre una burra, y un traidor de un médico que a los siete se atreve a sacarnos catorce onzas de sangre, como un enemigo" (Diálogos familiares sobre las letras y ciencias, II, f. 81<sup>r</sup>).<sup>17</sup>



It is unlikely, then, that the doctor came to be regarded during this period with the new esteem accorded to most letrados. However, there is some slight evidence to suggest that his profession was becoming slowly more respectable as the sixteenth century wore on. In his famous and influential Examen de ingenios (1575) Juan Huarte, himself a doctor, classed the medical profession as an oficio honrado, rather than as an oficio mecánico. At about the same time, Pedro de Mercado was weighing up the law versus medicine question, and allowing one of the speakers in his debate to defend the reputation of contemporary doctors, in a very reasoned manner. His argument is based on the notions that, in an imperfect world, doctors are more necessary than men of any other calling, that medicine is an art, and that there can be no more noble occupation than the conservation of human life: "La medicina, según muchos, es arte... la mayor nobleza de la medicina, ved cuánto es más noble su sujeto que él del derecho, que la medicina trata de la conservación de los hombres" (Diálogos de filosofía natural y moral, 1574, f. 108<sup>v</sup>).

All in all, the evidence offered here is too flimsy to support any specific or concrete conclusions. However, it does allow us to suggest tentatively that while, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, the concept of "ennobling employment" seems to have been applied with increasing conviction and frequency to the legal profession, doctors still appear to have been struggling at this point for an image of middle-class respectability. It seems possible that this discrepancy in the social standing of the two callings may have been due, in part, to a factor not mentioned so far: while the men at the top of the legal profession would surely have been in daily contact with the country's leading administrators - government officials, mayors, politicians - those at the lower end of the medical scale (notably surgeons and chemists) must have stood half-way between the letrado class and the less respectable commercial sector.



The Last of the Common Sort: the Merchant

The merchant seems to have been the man whose financial success accounted for many of the most marked social ascents of the age:

De eso se hacen los mercaderes tan poderosos que si miramos en ello, en todas las ciudades de España, los más ricos y demás principales casas son mercaderes, tanto que frezan con los caballeros, y muchos con los señores, y se tratan con más regalo que ellos, que más fino que ha pocos años que sus caudales se contaban por maravedís, y ya se cuentan por millares de ducados, y según van sus negocios adelante presto se contarán por millones.

Pedro de Mercado, Diálogos de filosofía natural y moral (1574), f. 134r.

He was, however, the last social climber to be granted any degree of respect in Spain, and the one most often picked out as the prototype of the vulgar nouveau riche. Of course, Ruth Pike (Aristocrats and Traders; Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century, Cornell, 1972) and Henri Lapeyre (Une famille de marchands: les Ruiz, Paris-Bordeaux, 1955) have shown that in sixteenth-century Seville the merchant's prosperity went hand-in-hand with a high social standing, and that intercourse between the commercial and aristocratic classes was frequent in this cosmopolitan port. However, both scholars point out that Seville was different from the rest of Spain in these respects, and certainly I have found that Spanish commentators writing in the first half of the sixteenth century invariably classify commerce as a dishonourable activity, to be avoided particularly by the man with pretensions to nobility.

The reasons for the inglorious reputation of the commercial world, and the long-lived bias against the merchant parvenu are not difficult to detect. Whereas the scholar-profiteer, for example, had had behind him the learning-virtue-nobility idea, and whereas the rich farmer had been able to find support for his case in idealized notions of the beatus ille kind, all that could ever be said in the merchant's favour, was that he



knew how to make money. We have already seen that this defence was not "philosophical" enough to stand up against sixteenth-century "scale of nature" arguments. Neither was it calculated to endear him to supporters of the traditional, non-materialistic view of nobility. Even more importantly, the fundamental Christian mistrust of any great concern with worldly goods frequently lead sixteenth-century moralists to confuse materialism with dishonesty, and to imply that the merchant's trade was a continual threat to his soul. Take, for example, Saravia de la Calle's Instrucción de mercaderes. Although this treatise aims to help merchants decide whether or not certain commercial deals are honest, it works from the premise that any money-making activity is basically un-Christian: "[es una cosa] muy grande, muy importante, muy provechosa...dejar la voluntad de ser rico, y los medios, que son los tratos...Plega a Nuestro Señor que de mil [mercaderes] que lean estos [consejos] ...que uno sólo dejase los tratos" (Instrucción de mercaderes, 1544, ff. ix<sup>r</sup>-ix<sup>v</sup>). Tomás de Mercado, writing a similar work some twenty years later, seems to have been less inclined to damn the merchant out of hand, but he, too, advises him to quell any worldly or ambitious desires: "El más propio es que pretenda proveer la República de los bastimientos, ropa e mercerías que le falta... sólo resta que pues no quieren justificarse tanto, pretendan sustentarse con la ganancia conforme a su estado" (Tomás de Mercado, Tratos y contratos de mercaderes, 1569, ff. 10<sup>v</sup>-11<sup>r</sup>).

It would appear from Sancho de Moncada's Restauración política de España (1615) that by the early seventeenth century there was a more general recognition of the economic need to promote Spanish trade. This probably helps to account for the fact that at this point also social commentators were beginning to mix their moralistic criticisms of the merchant with some acknowledgement of his practical abilities, and his usefulness to the Republic. Suárez de Figueroa, for example, begrudgingly concedes that although contemporary merchants are greedy and dishonest, their work is mentally demanding: "Esta profesión, cuanto a lo demás, es aguda, sutil,



ingeniosa y de trabajo. Requíérese para ella grandísima memoria, entendimiento, y noticia de varias cosas" (Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, Plaza universal de todas ciencias y artes, 1615, f. 246<sup>v</sup>). This attempt at fair-mindedness is obviously encouraging, but it in no way implies that the merchant's practical abilities qualify him for social promotion, and it is clear from its very brevity that the man of commerce still had a long way to go before achieving the more generous recognition accorded to the seventeenth-century civil servant, for example. However, it is unfair to assume, as some modern commentators have done, that Spaniards of this period gave no support at all to the man who rose through commerce.

One extremely original and forward-thinking writer of the sixteenth century, Bartolomé de Albornoz, not only launched a very open attack on the "Christian critics" of the merchant, but even went so far as to apply the word honroso to commercial activities:

Este oficio de mercader y trato de la mercadería es él que sustenta al mundo, y él que da noticia de las unas partes a las otras. Los que dicen que es peligroso al ánimo no tienen razón, y mucho menos los que... dicen que no es honroso. Se entenderá que el peligro (si alguno tiene) no es de su cosecha, sino por parte del mal uso a que le aplica quien le usa, y esto... es extrínseco del oficio... En cuanto a la honra, es como las demás cosas, que tanta honra tienen cuanto es la estima que de ellas se hace... que como la honra y la virtud (por nuestros pecados) siempre son vasallos del dinero, a quien le tiene (que son los mercaderes) obedece todo.

Bartolomé de Albornoz, Arte de los contratos (1573), f. 128r.

Characteristically, Albornoz does not object on moralistic grounds to the merchant's desire for social advancement; he simply remarks with playful irony that, if they did but know it, men of commerce are blessed with a social position which cannot be improved upon:

Lo que más me maravilla es que no conocen la perfección del estado que Dios les dio (ni la imperfección del que pretenden), sino que rabian y mueren por la caballería, como si estuviesen ciertos que no han de vivir sujetos a otros mercaderes, como los que verdaderamente son



caballeros lo están a ellos, mientras son mercaderes.  
Arte de los contratos, f. 128r.

Albornoz was very obviously a man in advance of his age, and this part of his treatise cannot be regarded as representing anything but an extremist minority viewpoint. However, according to Nicolás Antonio, this sixteenth-century professor of law (Mexico University), was something of an academic celebrity in his own day.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, it is possible that his views on the social standing of the merchant were quite widely known, if infrequently subscribed to.

Furthermore, even if we have to conclude that social commentators actually writing at the start of the seventeenth century generally took an idealistic stand against the merchant, it would be naive to suppose that altruistic and non-materialistic trends prevailed among the silent majority. Gonzalo de Correas Íñigo's seventeenth-century collection of refranes reflects, on the contrary, a very materialistic strain running through the "popular wisdom" of the period. Idealistic proverbs, like "todos somos hijos de Adán y Eva", and "pobreza no es vileza", are listed alongside their ironic, worldly-wise variants: "todos somos hijos de Adán y Eva, sino que nos diferencia la seda", and "quien dice que pobreza no es vileza, no tiene seso en la cabeza" (Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales). In fact, one of the refranes included by Correas provides concrete evidence for the argument that the development of a mild cynicism was one of the currents instrumental in the boosting of the merchant's image: "No compres de quien compró; compra de quien heredó, que no sabe lo que costó". Unfortunately, Correas does not add one of his explanatory notes to this particular pearl of wisdom, but its general drift is clear enough, and as the sixteenth century made way for the seventeenth, the same implied disapproval of the traditional noble's unworldly helplessness started to provide a stock barb for compilers of witty joke books: "Como en otras partes se ha dicho, la posesión de las riquezas suele inhabilitar a los hombres"; "El rico necio, dijo que era leño dorado, y el pobre discreto, oro enlodado" (Luis Rufo, Las quinientas apotegmas, 1600, nos. 445, 109).



It was almost to be expected, then, that in the first part of the seventeenth century traditional prejudices against the merchant parvenu, based on the image of him as an exceptionally greedy and materialistic man, should at last have begun to disappear. Benito de Peñalosa y Mondragón not only accepts with cheerful optimism the idea of bought nobility, but also implies that the established aristocracy themselves are beginning to look more kindly on those who - like the merchant - lay claim to noble status on the strength of riches alone:

No se puede negar sino que las riquezas por la mayor parte dan causa de ennoblecer a los que las tienen; y esto es por lo menos de hecho, por la buena opinión que los ricos han cobrado en el mundo; porque de ordinario vemos que los hombres plebeyos, siendo ricos y poderosos, usando de liberalidad con los vecinos que les podían ser contrarios, y tratándoles noblemente, vienen a tenerlos contentos, y con esto no sólo ganan opinión de nobles, mas de ilustres y dignos de grandes dignidades.

Benito de Peñalosa y Mondragón, Libro de las cinco excelencias del español (1629), f.87v.

To sum up, it cannot be denied that the man who rose through commerce had to struggle harder and longer for social acceptance than those of his promotion-seeking companions whose trades were less obviously "worldly". However, there is evidence to suggest that he did, in the latter part of our period, receive more general, and more wholehearted, support than is sometimes supposed. The fact that attitudes towards this allegedly "un-virtuous" social climber did finally begin to change, is particularly indicative of a progression in the underlying "social morality" of the age. I have already mentioned at various points that a general trend away from abstract idealism and towards more practical, materialistic values, was one of those ideological movements most beneficial to all kinds of social climbers. However, in order to understand how, within the space of one hundred and fifty years, the feeling behind the words "no habré vergüenza de ensuciar la hermosura del oro con fea ganancia" could

have been overtaken by sentiments like "quien dice que pobreza no es vileza no tiene seso en la cabeza", it is necessary to study in more detail the changing priorities in the social values of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The Underlying Development of Social Values:  
the Christian Basis

From the beginning of our period until the end of it, discussions of nobility, and indeed, of social classification generally, hinged, in one way or another, around the concept of moral worth. It was therefore inevitable that attitudes towards the social climber should change, as new interpretations of the notion of Christian virtue came into force. As we have already seen, the earliest theorists of nobility talked of virtue as an abstract kind of "goodness", which embraced all admirable qualities, and which was the special prerogative of the noble. Clearly visible behind this traditional view was the belief in a scale of nature in which the aristocrat's position was nearer to God than was that occupied by the common man. However, the relationship between Christian teachings and social ideology was as complex then as it is now, and the perfectly orthodox Christian precept "all men are equal" was as valid a basis for social argument as was the conflicting "scale of nature" idea. The difficulty lies in deciding whether the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries actually did apply the "equality of all men" precept to social problems.

Carmen Olga Brenes (El sentimiento democrático en el teatro de Juan Ruiz de Alarcón, Hollywood, 1960) argues that throughout this period Spaniards had a strong sense of social and political democracy, which stemmed from the religious ideal of universal equality. On the other hand, J.A. Maravall y Casenoves (Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca, Madrid, 1972) insists that Spaniards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries took this maxim of universal equality to mean only that all men were equal in the face of death. Unfortunately,



from our point of view, both scholars draw their evidence from works of literature, rather than from social or religious commentaries. My own impression is that some Spaniards were aware very early on of the social implications of the Christian equality ideal, but that few cared to press them to their logical conclusions. Sixteenth-century theorists of nobility, for example, skirted the problem very neatly by saying that all men could achieve "nobleza teológica", but that this was a separate kind of excellence from that implied by the term "nobleza política". Theologians seem to have been equally guilty of avoiding the issue: they repeated time and again that all men were equal in the eyes of God, but declined to tackle the problem of whether the classless structure of Heaven should therefore be reflected on earth.<sup>21</sup> Of those writers who were bold enough to discuss the social, as well as the spiritual, implications of the "all men are equal" maxim, some argued that because all men were invested with spiritual equality, it was morally wrong for them to strive for greater social equality: "Porque honra es arma del diablo que es padre de la soberbia" (E. López de Villalobos, Libro intitulado los problemas de Villalobos, 1543, f. 28<sup>v</sup>).

However, as we have already seen, ironic seventeenth-century variants on the "todos somos hijos de Adán y Eva" refrán bespoke a far less idealistic application of the Christian equality notion, and it is significant that, already, in the fifteenth century, Fernando de Pulgar was defending the social climber on precisely these grounds of universal equality:

Todos somos nacidos de una masa y hubimos un principio noble... vemos por experiencia algunos hombres destos que juzgamos nacidos de baja sangre, forzarles su natural inclinación a dejar los oficios bajos de los padres, y aprender ciencias, y ser grandes letrados; vemos asimismo otros que tienen inclinación natural a las armas y a la agricultura... Así no se debe haber por molesto tener riquezas y honras aquellos que parece no las deben tener, y carecer dellas los que por linaje parece que las merecen.  
Letras de Fernando Pulgar (1487), BAE, XIII, p. 476.

This is the earliest evidence I have found of support



for the upstart in Spain, and the fact that it is based on the religious premise of universal equality leads me to suspect that this was, almost certainly, one of the first catalytic notions to act upon the old "inherited noble virtue" ideal.

The Christian Basis Re-Interpreted - Two Different Results

We have already seen that the first development in the concept of "virtue" as a criterion for the setting of social status, took place towards the middle of the sixteenth century, when it was proposed that learning was virtuous and that the learned commoner therefore had some claim to nobility. We now see that even earlier than this, one writer at least was using the learned upstart as the chief illustration of his argument that the spiritual equality of all men could indeed have social implications. It therefore seems fair to conclude that the "nobility of learning" idea, and social interpretations of the Christian equality notion were probably gaining ground in Spain at about the same time. They would seem to have been co-operative in widening the sense of "noble virtue" until it became "virtue, inherited for some, at birth, but attainable by all through learning".

I have argued previously that the next step in the progression of social values was taken nearer the end of the sixteenth century, when the "virtue of learning" notion came to be understood in an increasingly practical sense. Ideological developments at this stage also seem to have been linked with the fact that the original discrepancy in Christian teachings on class (the "scale of nature" idea versus "universal equality") gave rise to two conflicting interpretations of "virtue". At this point, both were applied mainly to the rich peasant and the scholar-profiteer. On the one hand, the "scale of nature" argument had given rise to the premise that the commoner could be as virtuous as the nobleman, providing that he - and his sons - stayed in their God-given place, and kept the national finances afloat (see, for example, Pedro de Mercado's invectives against social



climbers). In direct conflict with this interpretation of virtue as "unambitious usefulness to the Republic", was the argument which descended from the universal equality precept. It took virtue to mean "social usefulness which should be rewarded with social promotion" ("Lo cuarto que hace al hombre ser estimado es tener alguna dignidad o oficio honroso"): all men are basically equal, and if the commoner can prove that he is as useful to the community as the noble, then he deserves to be accorded noble status.

Of course, the "social utility" basis shared by these conflicting interpretations of virtue indicates that an increased sense of economic necessity was a prime factor in the development of both left-wing and right-wing values at this stage. However, whereas upholders of the first argument did not allow an awareness of the economic situation to prevent them from commending, for example, the impoverished gentleman of leisure, those who took up the second viewpoint used arguments of economic necessity to push the interpretation of virtue as "rewardable usefulness" still further: so far, in fact, that some of them finished by applying the word "virtuous" to materialistic activities, more frequently than to traditional noble ideals.

#### The Last Stage: Materialism as a Prime Social Value

We have already suggested that there was an increasing tendency in the last years of the sixteenth, and the first years of the seventeenth, centuries, to view questions of social change from a materialistic angle. This social pragmatism often went hand-in-hand with a faintly ironic attitude (as in Albornoz's treatise, for example). Nevertheless, I would maintain that the new, open acknowledgement of materialism as a natural human impulse, was part of a meaningful anti-idealism trend, itself resultant from the developments which the concept of virtue, as a criterion for social status, had undergone. Just as the idea of "inherited noble virtue" had been replaced by the notion that honour was attainable by all who performed useful jobs, supporters of the

"rewardable utility" notion were now beginning to argue that the economic usefulness (and therefore the virtue and honour) of a job was usually commensurate with the amount of wealth accumulated by the man who performed it; "Más vale el pechero rico que el hidalgo pobre", as the seventeenth-century catchphrase put it. It was finally being acknowledged, in fact, that social ambition and materialism - the very impulses which gave the upstart his drive - could constitute better social virtues than the traditional Christian-ascetic ideals of the blood nobility.

As final evidence of the growing admiration for "honourable materialism", we may quote from Baltasar Mateo Velázquez's book of "everyday advice", directed, by the author's own claim, to people of all classes. In his ABC of how to bring up children, Velázquez includes the following precepts:

O: Ociosos mozos y ociosas mozas no aumentan hacienda, y causan deshonra.

V: Virtudes le enseña niño a tu hijo, si quieres verle rico.

Baltasar Mateo Velázquez, El filósofo del aldea y sus conversaciones familiares (1626), ed. Cotarelo y Mori, p. 176.

The Christian insistence on moral worth as a determining factor of social status is still present, but it bears a completely different interpretation: the old virtue = bravery = honour equation has become virtue = useful work = riches = honour.

Obviously, this progression in underlying social values, brought about by the shifting tensions between Christian ideology and economic necessity, did not take place in clearcut stages. There were a few, even at the end of the fifteenth, and start of the sixteenth, centuries, who were already questioning the traditional "inherited noble virtue" belief. There were doubtless many more who were still, by the middle of the seventeenth century, reacting with distaste to the new, pragmatic social priorities. Nevertheless, it seems to me that, taken on an overall basis, Spanish social values - upon which



attitudes to the social climber depended - underwent an amazingly radical transformation in a relatively short period of time.

### Marriage out of Class

#### Traditional Theory and Contemporary Practice

Although I have, for the sake of convenience, separated the figure of the social climber from the phenomenon of the mésalliance, it goes without saying that the two were closely bound up for Spaniards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. From the point of view of the rich bourgeois, marriage out of class was one way of acquiring the honour needed to boost his social standing, and as far as the impoverished nobleman was concerned, the admittance of a rich commoner into the family could often help to solve the problems raised by aristocratic status without aristocratic fortune: "Un hidalgo pobre que se había casado con una hija de un labrador rico, porque le dieron gran dote, decía que aquel casamiento era como morcilla, que él puso la sangre, y el suegro las cebollas" (Melchor de Santa Cruz y Dueñas, Floresta española, 1580, ed. H. López de Yanguas, p. 145). Unfortunately, we do not know exactly how frequent such marriages were during our period. This is one of the aspects of Spanish social history which is in dire need of the kind of solid statistical research which Lawrence Stone, for example, has done for seventeenth-century England.<sup>22</sup> However, the available evidence suggests that unequal marriages were occurring frequently enough to provide contemporary social commentators with a burning topic, and to give marriage writers cause for repeating with nagging insistence "toma tu igual".

It is, in fact, a marital theorist who gives us one of our earliest indications of the growing number of unequal marriages in sixteenth-century Spain: "Vemos ya confundidas las edades y los estados y los linajes, que la moza se casa con el viejo por sólo ser rico, y los caballeros con las labradoras porque tienen hacienda, y los necios y bobos hallan buenas

.  
 .  
 mujeres si tienen dineros:el dinero se casa hoy día"  
 (Francisco de Ossuna,El norte de los estados,1550,f.37<sup>V</sup>).  
 Only two years later,another marriage writer,Pedro de  
 Luján,was repeating Ossuna's observation almost word for  
 word (Coloquios matrimoniales,1552,f.9<sup>V</sup>),and even if  
 one is inclined to allow for an element of exaggeration  
 in the generalized statements made by these moralists,  
 the number of interclass marriage jokes which began to  
 appear in the humorous anthologies of the period point  
 to the truth of their basic assertion.Santa Cruz's  
Floresta española (1580) has a marriage section which  
 contains twenty-seven jokes;eleven of these - just under  
 half - concern unequal marriage or the power of money  
 in courtship.Similarly,several of the witty stories  
 which figure in Luis Rufo's Las quinientas apotegmas  
 (1600) touch upon the mésalliance in the casual kind of  
 way which implies that it would by no means have been a  
 topic unfamiliar to his readers:"Una moza rica y hermosa,  
 e hija de padres honrados se enamoró de un pobre mozo..."  
 (no.270).Other evidence could be given to show that  
 moralists,theorists and humorists were all interested in  
 the unequal marriage as a sign of the changing times.  
 However,there are enough illustrations here to indicate  
 that,even if interclass marriage was still,by the end of  
 the sixteenth century,a novelty,practised by the few and  
 discussed by the many,it was nevertheless regarded as  
 a social phenomenon of the age,significant enough to call  
 for commentary,jokes and reprobations.

#### The Interclass Marriage Controversy as a Peculiarly Spanish Phenomenon

Strangely enough,the mésalliance controversy does  
 not seem to have been a general European feature of  
 the age to the same extent as the associated upstart  
 debate clearly was.The specialist historians listed in  
 footnote nine all agree that interclass marriages,usually  
 arranged,and based on the exchange of honour for money  
 principle,were frequent in England and France.As far as  
 I can see,however,such matches do not seem to have  
 provoked a storm of protest and heated discussion



in these countries, as they did in Spain. F.W. Wadsworth's study of the social background to Webster's The Duchess of Malfi ("Webster's Duchess of Malfi in the Light of Some Contemporary Ideas on Marriage and Remarriage", Philological Quarterly, XXXV (1956), 394-407) shows that the focus in English marital theorists was more on the controversial questions of remarriage and Catholic/Protestant matches, than on that of marrying out of class. In France, on the other hand, an obsession with the argument about marriage and parental consent seems to have prevented marital writers like Pierre Lemerre (Justifications des usages de France sur le mariage, 1687) and Jean de Coras (Paraphrase sur l'edict des mariages, 1572) from discussing other matrimonial problems. As we shall see later, the Tridentine topics of parental consent and clandestine marriage were closely bound up in Spain itself with the mésalliance question but, as far as I can judge, French writers do not seem to have made the same strong links between them.

#### The Orthodox Spanish Viewpoint

The unequal marriage, whether based on love or materialism, was traditionally abhorred in Spain. If writers like Ossuna and Luján continued to perpetuate the all-but unshakeable notion that marriages made for worldly gain defiled the sacred nature of matrimony, others objected more strongly to the romantic mésalliance, because it implied a disrespect for social degree, and raised "insuppressible" practical problems. It seems that well into the seventeenth century "toma tu igual" was an indispensable formula for anyone writing didactically on the subject of marriage. However, by examining variations in the uses of this formula, and developments in the ideas which went with it - the social position of the offspring of a mésalliance, the arranged match, the secret ceremony - it is possible to trace a gradual increase of sympathy towards both kinds of unequal marriage.

Central to the topic as a whole, of course, was

the concept of freedom: the freedom of a young girl to reject a socially advantageous match arranged for her by her parents, and the freedom of lovers to marry, in spite of class barriers, if necessary. The main factor operative in the evolvement of sixteenth-century attitudes towards such freedom in marriage must surely have been the new stand which the Church took on clandestine marriages and enforced unions, after the Council of Trent.

### Tridentine Rulings on Marriage: Research to Date

The Council of Trent took place between 1545 and 1563. The reformatory decrees which it produced were translated into Spanish in 1564, by López de Ayala, and were immediately promulgated as national laws by Philip II. Among the non-dogmatic reformatory decrees were several which related to marriage, and one of these - the one which aroused most comment in Spain - concerned clandestine marriages. A substantial amount of research has been done on the social implications of, and the Spanish background to, this new ruling on secret marriage, and the body of knowledge which has been built up is best summarized briefly in tabulated form:<sup>23</sup>

1. Clandestine marriages had disturbed both secular and ecclesiastical authorities in Spain, as in the rest of Europe, from the late Middle Ages onwards.
2. It was believed that the possibility of marriage per verba de praesenti (with mutual oral consent, but without ceremony, witnesses or documentation) lay at the root of this problem.
3. The controversy came to a head when Protestant leaders began to argue that marriage was not a Sacrament, but a civil contract and, as such, was invalid, unless<sup>24</sup> made publically and with parental consent.
4. The Council therefore had to decide whether marriage should have more of a civil than a sacramental basis, and whether the Church could, accordingly, invalidate marriages made with the mutual consent of the partners, but without witnesses or parental approbation.
5. The Council concluded that marriage was a Sacrament, but effectively gave civil authorities more jurisdiction over it by stipulating that a union could not receive the sacramental form



unless the following requirements were fulfilled:a)that it be preceded by a publication of the banns in three consecutive public masses,b)that it be contracted in the presence of three witnesses,including a priest,c)that it be recorded in writing.

From this summary it will be seen that scholars have tended to stress the "tightening up" aspect of the Tridentine rulings on secret marriage. What they have suggested, in fact, is that, by eliminating the possibility of marriage per verba de praesenti, the Council was working against the concept of "marital freedom", because it was depriving young lovers of their last escape from outside opposition. While having little to offer in the way of new historical material, I would argue that this interpretation of the Tridentine stand on marriage puts the picture out of focus.

#### The Church's Emphasis on Marital Freedom

Firstly, it should be stressed that the Church was in a difficult position: on the one hand, secular authorities were clamouring for help in the stemming of clandestine marriages. On the other, the sacramental status of marriage could only be protected if due emphasis was given to the notion that even the Church could not interfere with the essential form of marriage, as constituted by a simple consent between the partners. Considering, then, the delicate balance which had to be struck between secular and ecclesiastical interests, it is not surprising that the Council's decree on the reformation of marriage reflects a more ambiguous attitude than we are sometimes given to suppose. It begins by stating that secret marriages are valid "mientras la Iglesia Católica no los hizo irritos", and then goes on to make full use of this qualifying clause: "Los que...atentaren contraer matrimonio de otro modo que a presencia de párroco...quedan absolutamente inhábiles por disposición de este Santo Concilio para contraerlo aun de este modo; y decreta que sean irritos y nulos semejantes contratos" (El sacrosanto euménico

y general Concilio de Trento, traslado por Ignacio López de Ayala, 1564, sesión xxiv, cap. 1, p. 377). It would seem that, while the Church saw the need to put an end to clandestine marriages in practical terms, it had no wish to abandon the "free", sacramental image of matrimony, and could not, therefore, bring itself to refute openly the old idea that a secret marriage was, in the eyes of God, a true marriage.

Secondly, the Council seems to have aimed at balancing out its prevention of secret marriages, by denying the power of parental consent to either make or break a marriage. The reformation decree refutes firmly the Protestant argument for marriage as a social contract which is incomplete without parental consent: "La Iglesia ... condena con excomunión... los que falsamente aseguran que son irritos los matrimonios contraídos por hijos de familia sin consentimiento de sus padres" (p. 375). A later chapter adds emphasis to this manifestation of the Council's concern with marital freedom:

Llegan a cegar muchísimas veces en tanto grado la codicia y otros afectos terrenos los ojos del alma a los señores temporales y magistrados, que fuerzan con amenazas y penas a los hombres y mujeres que viven bajo su jurisdicción... para que contraigan matrimonio, aunque repugnantes, con las personas que los mismos señores les señalan... manda el Santo Concilio a todos, de cualquier grado, dignidad y condición que sean, so pena de excomunión, en que ha de incurrir ipso facto, que de ningún modo violenten, directa o indirectamente a sus súbditos, ni a otros ningunos, en términos de que dejen de contraer con toda libertad sus matrimonios.  
cap. ix, pp. 388-389.

If the Church had effectively curtailed the kind of marital freedom encouraged by the system of "informal marriages", it had made substantial amends by forbidding enforced marriages, and by emphasizing the fact that - so long as a marriage was publically contracted - it could not be invalidated by any lack of parental consent.

Thirdly, it is clear from one obvious "loophole"



in the Tridentine ruling against clandestine marriages, that the Church wished to allow for cases where an "unpublished" union was the only means by which lovers could defeat parental opposition. The decree states that the publication of the banns may - at the discretion of the Parish priest, and with the backing of a dispensation - be omitted: "Y si en alguna ocasión hubiere sospechas fundadas de que se podrá impedir maliciosamente el matrimonio, si preceden tantas amonestaciones; hágase sólo una en este caso; o a lo menos celébrese el matrimonio a presencia del párroco, y dos o tres testigos" (cap. 1, p. 376).

#### Spanish Reactions to the Tridentine Marital Rulings

Having argued that the Church was aiming in the mid-sixteenth century for a greater stress on freedom of choice and consent in marriage, we have now to show that Spaniards of the age approved and took up this new trend. Of course, we would not expect to find in Spain open objections, of the kind which French writers were making, to the Council's rulings on marriage and parental consent. The Tridentine decrees were never officially disputed or overruled in Spain, as they were in France, and the very fact that they were absorbed so quickly into Spanish legislation made it inevitable that most of the commentary on them should be explicatory rather than argumentative. Nevertheless, the evidence does tend to suggest that these new religious teachings were generally approved of, and that they helped to smooth paths and soften attitudes towards young lovers. Justina Ruiz de Conde has already documented the changes in Spanish law which resulted from the Tridentine marital decrees.<sup>25</sup> Consequently, we need only note here that legal collections prior to the publication of the decrees were apt to support the parent who forced marriages on his children (particularly on his daughters), and that this was no longer the case in the legislation which appeared after 1564. For example, Hugo de Celso's Leyes de todos los

reinos de Castilla y León (1538) had stated firmly "Las hijas no se pueden desposar o casar sin consentimiento de sus padres..."(f.103<sup>V</sup>). Felipe II's Nueva recopilación (1564) took a very different line: "Mandamos que ninguno de los grandes de nuestros reinos...apremien a ninguna dueña ni doncella a que se case contra su voluntad"(f.286<sup>R</sup>).

Of course, theory and practice are two different things, and there was nothing to stop an enraged father from hindering his daughter's marriage by threatening her with disinheritance, for example. However, it seems from the works of two very eminent and influential theologians that, even in cases of this kind, priests were encouraged to support the wayward couple rather than the dissenting parents. Pedro de Ledesma sympathizes with the father whose children are not sufficiently dutiful to consult him before contracting a marriage. He is anxious, however, that such a parent should not avail himself too readily of his legal right to punish the couple, "porque las leyes son rigurosas, y en alguna manera son contrarias a la libertad del matrimonio" (Pedro de Ledesma, Suma de los sacramentos, 1601, p.111). Martín de Azpilcueta, whose Manual de confesores y penitentes was popular enough to be published in eight editions between 1563 and 1590, is even more explicit about the kind of circumstances in which the Church's new emphasis on marital freedom should encourage special support for young lovers. He gives us good reason to believe that the Council's qualification of the amonestaciones rule was, indeed, understood in Spain as a potential "loophole":

También cuando hay justa causa para ello se pueden casar secretamente. Como cuando la huérfana, por temor que sus tutores la casen con quien no le conviene, con daño de su dote o herencia, se casa secretamente con quien le conviene...todas las cosas que son justas para por ellas dispensar, basta, que noble se casa con quien no lo es, rico con pobre, viejo con moza...

Martín de Azpilcueta, Manual de confesores y penitentes (1590), p.424.



Clearly, one theologian at least was applying the notion of "willing consent" in the most practical of terms, even using it as a basis for supporting - indirectly - the case of the unequal lovers.

As final evidence for the argument that the Tridentine rulings on marriage did - contrary to what is usually suggested - encourage Spaniards of the sixteenth century to realize the importance of this kind of marital freedom, we should glance briefly at two secular works.

Hernando de Soto's Emblemas moralizadas (1599) is not, on the whole, an exceptional work of its kind. It draws on the standard maxims and admonitions which often attracted collectors of emblems. Therefore, the fact that it includes an illustrated invective against enforced marriage, accompanied by a reference to the Council's decrees, is surely indicative of the probability that the concept of marital freedom was becoming - thanks to the Tridentine rulings - one of the age's stock moral precepts: "Este lazo perpetuo (según se definió en el Santo Concilio de Trento) requiere... libre voluntad... la unión de dos voluntades no ha de ser forzada" (Emblemas moralizadas, f. 51<sup>r</sup>). Bartolomé de Albornoz is even more assertive in his commentary on the Council's marital freedom rulings:

Es un bravo decreto... que el hijo es él que se casa, y ha de vivir con ella, y no su padre ... muchos curas y Ordinarios a quien se pide esta remisión [de las amonestaciones] no la quieren dar... sino que se haga el matrimonio con la solemnidad que manda el Concilio. Absolutamente se ha de tener que el cura o Ordinario que hace eso peca mortalmente... está obligado no solamente a impedir, mas aun a procurar con todas sus fuerzas que el Sacramento se haga, y si diere de ello noticias a quien lo puede impedir, peca mortalmente... No digo yo, ni quiero, que el sacerdote sea casamentero de nadie para concertarlos... sino que cuando los que se han de casar entre sí están concertados, no ose él usar de su oficio (y del poder que le da la Iglesia) para desconcertarlos.

Bartolomé de Albornoz, Arte de los contratos (1573), ff. 153v-154r.

Again, we have to bear in mind Albornoz's exceptionally original and "progressive" bent; we are unlikely to find many writers of this period willing, or able, to back up the Church's new marital teachings with such force, cogency and authority. However, his treatise is intended, in some sense, as a work of didactic leadership - aimed at those who need help in unravelling legal and theological knots. Furthermore, Albornoz defends the concept of free matrimonial choice on the same grounds as those chosen by some of his less forthright contemporaries. This encourages me to think that he might justly be regarded, in this case, as a leading spokesman of the increasingly influential "Christian progressives".

Overlapping Concepts: Enforcements, Arrangements,  
"voluntad" and Love

All that has been said about the Tridentine marital decrees suggests that the general tendency was for the enforced marriage to be linked with the notion of materialism, and the opposed marriage with that of voluntad. This raises three important and interlocking questions: a) was the idea of the arranged marriage synonymous with those of the enforced and the materially advantageous match? b) Was the norm an enforced, or a freely-chosen union? c) When writers spoke of marriages based on voluntad, did they mean "love" in the sense that we understand it?

To begin with the first two questions, there must, almost certainly, have been some examples in sixteenth-century Spain of both marital enforcements and unions freely chosen: otherwise the former concept could not have provoked so much protest, nor the latter so much praise. However, it is likely that the norm lay somewhere between the two. Pedro de Luján was confident that the average woman would not be forced into marrying anyone against her will: "Con nuestra voluntad y no sin ella nos casamos con ellos" (Coloquios matrimoniales, 1552, f. 31<sup>v</sup>). On the other hand, even in the seventeenth century, Francisco de Cascales assumed that a girl



would be less active than her parents in the picking out of suitable marriage partners: "Ese cuidado no ha de ser suyo, sino de sus padres" (Cartas filológicas, 1634, f.97<sup>r</sup>). The obvious conclusion is that women particularly were brought up to expect firm parental guidance during the courtship period, and that the absence of any positive dislike between the partners of an arranged match was probably enough to prevent it from being resented - by anyone - as an enforced union. Furthermore, it would seem that the materialistic marriage of convenience was acceptable to, and indeed, preferred by, at least one young man who was hindered by no parental restrictions at all. Henri Lapeyre's case history of an eminent Franco-Spanish commercial family tells how Simón Ruiz took his second wife from an aristocratic Spanish line, and quotes the merchant's own evaluation of the union: "Es haber sido Dios servido que me haya casado, cosa que estaba muy fuera de mi voluntad, pero ofrecióse, negocio que me pareció estaba bien, y este deseo de tener hijos, y así me hube de determinar de que estoy contento, y doy gracias a Dios por ello" (Henri Lapeyre, Une famille de marchands: les Ruiz, Paris-Bordeaux, 1955, p.76n.185). Clearly, it would be wrong to suppose either that the materialistic marriage of convenience was invariably associated with notions of enforcement, or that the arranged marriage was necessarily regarded as incompatible with the principle of willing consent.

In fact, it is quite possible that, in the mid-sixteenth century, the arranged marriage was associated less with the concept of force, than with the marital ideal of voluntades acordadas. For many writers this phrase seems to have meant little more than "temperamentally well-matched": "Así como dos ojos, siendo diversos en el sitio, son uno solo en el acto de la vista, porque ambos convienen en la cosa que se ve... el marido y la mujer... deben ser una cosa sola en voluntad, de manera que un solo querer gobierne dos corazones" (Juan Pérez de Moya, Comparaciones o símiles para los vicios y virtudes, 1584, f.22<sup>v</sup>). This harmony



of personalities, it was often argued, could be judged better by the parent casamenteros, than by the couple themselves, and was certainly to be preferred to romantic love, as a basis for slowly-developing marital affection: "Para que los casamientos sean perpetuos, sean amorosos y sean sabrosos, primero entre él y ella han de afudarse los corazones que no se tomen las manos ... todo casamiento hecho por amores, las más veces para en dolores" (Antonio de Guevara, Epístolas familiares, 1578, p. 294).

This, of course, brings us to the third question posed previously: romantic love, as we conceive of it, was not what most sixteenth-century Spaniards meant when they spoke of "voluntad". In fact, for many, romantic love was synonymous with lascivious passion: "En queriendo tomar el mancebo mujer y casarse, la lujuria habla, diciendo que sea hermosa... la juventud y el amor dicen ser ciegos" (Francisco de Ossuna, El norte de los estados, 1550, f. 27<sup>r</sup>). As such, it was generally considered to be too short-lived to constitute a satisfactory basis for marriage: "El casamiento que [por deleite de los amores] se hace... pocas veces tiene buena salida, y así entrambas las partes se tienen por descontentas y arrepentidas" (E. López de Villalobos, Los problemas de Villalobos, 1543, f. 18<sup>v</sup>). In effect, it would appear that, even after the Council of Trent, the standard conception of a "good marriage" was neither a love match nor an enforced union, but a middle-of-the-road compromise, in which willing consent, arrangement, love and compatability all overlapped to a large extent. With this prevalent emphasis on compromise, it is not surprising that it took so long for a clear distinction to be made between the materialistic and the romantic mésalliance. Because it was considered unwise and extremist to look, just for beauty, or just for material gain, in a prospective partner, the unequal marriage and the marriage based upon romantic love were inevitably brought together under the same headings of "foolish" and "impracticable".

However, we have already seen that some of the later writers who concerned themselves with practical



applications of the Tridentine decrees, suggested that special help should be given to couples whose marriages were opposed. Two of these commentators, Azpilcueta and Albornoz, also noted that outside opposition in such cases might well be due to some social disparity between the partners. From these facts we can make two deductions: firstly, that some couples must have been flouting both their parents and the standards of their age in an attempt - presumably - to base their marriages on something stronger than voluntades acordadas. Secondly, this rebellious minority was evidently associated in the minds of commentators with the notion of marriage out of class. Given, then, that theological interpreters like Azpilcueta and Albornoz were perpetuating the idea that the Church was especially sympathetic to these opposed marriages, it was inevitable that, sooner or later, a general tendency should grow up to distinguish between the love-based and the materialistic mésalliance, with a strong preference, at first, for the former. This seems to have been what happened towards the end of the sixteenth century.

#### New Signs of Approval for the Romantic Mésalliance

In point of fact, there is some slight evidence to suggest that even before this date romantic love was recognized, by some, as a social force. As early as 1529 Antonio de Guevara was warning parents that a watched daughter was not necessarily a safe daughter, because "los que de corazón se aman, sólo con el corazón se hablan" (El reloj de príncipes y libro de Marco Aurelio, 1529, f. 28<sup>r</sup>). Earlier still, Fernando de Pulgar was not only acknowledging the power of love, as an everyday reality, but even advising "cierto caballero" to allow his nephew to contract a love match:

Ciertamente, señor, muchas son las variedades que se revuelven toda hora en el pecho del enamorado, y grandes son las penas que le deleitan y las sospechas que le penan... Así que, señor, porque la prudencia es la que

gobierna y no consiente fealdad de las cosas,  
si entendéis que no la hay en alguna de las  
partes, pues la doncella es buena e hija de  
buena, concluidlo en hora buena.

Letras de Fernando de Pulgar (1487), BAE., XIII, p.56.

As we have noted before, Fernando de Pulgar seems, like Bartolomé de Albornoz, to have been a man in advance of his age, at least insofar as questions of class and marriage were concerned. Furthermore, neither he nor Guevara link the notion of love as a social reality with the concept of marriage out of class. However, it is worth bearing in mind the possibility that, even before the Council of Trent, there may have been some Spaniards who were prepared to believe in "true love" as a valid social force, and a potential social value.

Certainly, by the last third of the sixteenth century, the association between "true love" and unequal marriage was sometimes made, and occasionally condoned. Juan de Mal Lara lists several refranes relating to interclass marriage. His commentaries on those which imply a materialistic view of the mésalliance are invariably harsh: "Toma tu igual y véte a mendigar" - "Estas son palabras de un hombre interesal, y que no sabe más que procurar la hacienda" (Juan de Mal Lara, La filosofía vulgar, 1568, ed. Antonio Vilanova, II, pp. 205-206). This is not the case when he is dealing with the romantic mésalliance: "Si quieres bien casar, casa con tu igual" - "Es error muy grande el casamiento desigual salvo si Dios no les hace iguales en amor, y que haya entre ellos tal conformidad que entonces se podrían llamar iguales" (II, p. 185). Mal Lara's tentative defence of the unequal love match is closely bound up with another contemporary topic - that of the battle of the sexes. Fuller reference to this aspect of the question will be made later. However, it may be relevant to note here that Mal Lara is more sympathetic than many of his contemporaries to the notion of the romantic mésalliance, because he takes the standard ideal of voluntades acordadas to mean more than just "temperamental harmony". In context, his "conformidad" implies a personal equality between man and wife - an equality which is so complete that it negates disparity of social degree.



As a final sign of the growing sympathy towards the romantic mésalliance, we should return once again to Salas Barbadillo. Since his Perfecto caballero represents, in many ways, a strictly conservative perspective on contemporary social issues, it is all the more rewarding to find that this author appears to have had a soft spot for unequal lovers. Not only does he allow his perfect gentleman to marry the daughter of a foreign king, he also excuses the union of a noble camarero and a peasant girl: "aunque no casó con mujer que le igualase en sangre, por lo menos limpia y tanto que por ella no perderían sus hijos ningún puesto honrado" (El perfecto caballero, 1620, ed. P. Marshall, p. 38). If a work as openly didactic and exemplary as Salas Barbadillo's could justify the love-based mésalliance as easily as this, then certainly the concept itself must have been gaining considerable ground in the first part of the seventeenth century. On the other hand, it would again be foolish to assume that, because certain writers were showing more favour towards the romantic, than towards the materialistic mésalliance, the silent majority necessarily shared their idealistic viewpoint. Common sense dictates that, in a society where some degree of parental guidance was normal in the marriage-making process, the ambition-based mésalliance would have been more common than the unequal love match. Furthermore, having seen how a growing tendency towards pragmatic social values helped the upstart on his way, one would not expect to find that the materialistic mésalliance was denied for long the tolerance which some sixteenth-century writers were already showing towards the romantically unequal marriage. However, before going on to trace a softening in attitudes towards the materialistic unequal marriage, it should be noted that one of the factors most beneficial to changes in the mésalliance ideology generally, was a gradual relaxation of the precepts which governed the progenital side of the rank/marriage question.

Developments in the Genetic Aspect of the *Mésalliance*  
Problem: the Traditional "Rules"

Alfonso el Sabio's objections to the unequal marriage all arose from the premise that it devalued the nobility of the father's line of descent. He ruled that the children born of a noble father and a plebeian mother should be demoted in rank, although not excluded altogether from the aristocratic hierarchy: "Por hidalgo se puede contar mas no por noble". To the offspring of the noblewoman and the plebeian man he denied any kind of blue-blooded status: "No tuviesen por derecho que fuesen contados por hidalgos" (Partida II, Título XXI, Ley III). That this notion of inherited dishonour continued to lie at the heart of some theoretical objections to interclass marriage, until at least the end of the sixteenth century, may be gathered from the anonymous Tratado de nobleza (1595), which - like Alfonso's Partida - emphasizes particularly the devaluation of rank perpetuated by the woman who marries beneath herself: "Y si naciesen de hijadalgo y de hombre que no lo fuese, en Castilla tiénese por derecho que no sean contados por hijosdalgo, porque siempre los hombres el ser y nombre del padre deben anteponer" (El tratado de nobleza, 1595, f. 4<sup>v</sup>).

It is clear, furthermore, that this extra dishonour attached to the mésalliance in which the woman was the superior partner, was not just a feature of dry, theoretical writings. It was taken up and applied in all kinds of everyday contexts. For example, one of Luis Rufo's jokes points up a general Spanish awareness of paternal status as the determining factor of social degree: "En Francia vale la hidalguía de parte de la madre, y se prefiere, como en España, la del padre de cada uno, la cual opinión revalida la demostración matemática, y el caso de las mulas, que toman de la madre más calidad que del padre" (Luis Rufo, Las quinientas apotegmas, 1600, f. 8<sup>r</sup>). More importantly, from our point of view, Pedro de Luján adds to his warning against marriages made up the scale the remark "eso me da en el varón más que en la mujer" (Coloquios matrimoniales, 1552, f. 8<sup>r</sup>). However, it is



significant that in Luján's work the emphasis is less on the male predominance in progenital status determination, than on the idea expressed by the popular refrán, "la mujer sea igual, o menor, si quiere ser señor".

A New Perspective: the "Human" Versus the Genetical Aspects of Marriage

Clearly, somewhere along the line, the application of Alfonso el Sabio's idea had been twisted. Whereas the Wise King had half-excused the man who married beneath himself, on the grounds that he could still pass on some of his status to his descendants, a seventeenth-century proverb was now half-advising a man to marry beneath himself, on the grounds that it would give him the upper hand over his wife. Questions relating to sexual equality during this period will receive fuller treatment in the chapter on strong women and weak men. However, we should note here that, because some sixteenth-century theorists were less interested in the genetical aspect of the mésalliance question, than in the "human" problems of female dominance and personal equality, they also began to reject - albeit tacitly - some of the most traditional "technical" arguments against interclass marriage. Vicente Mexía furnishes a very clear example of this change in marital priorities. He not only refrains from lamenting the fact that a noblewoman debases the blood of her future offspring if she chooses to marry her servant, but even suggests that the "natural law" which ensures his dominance over her after their marriage, constitutes a more powerful force, and a better marital value, than the man-made barrier which separated them before marriage:

Porque dado que ella primero hubiese sido su señora, y él fuera su criado, el día que se casasen se mudaría este orden que de antes habían tenido, y él quedaría por principal y señor, y ella por sujeta y obediente a él todo el tiempo que viviesen juntos y durase el matrimonio. Y en esto no ha de pensar que se le hace injuria ni otro ningún agravio de que con razón se pueda quejar: porque el primer orden que se guardaba entre ellos, antes que se

casasen, era cosa humana...mas el segundo, donde ha de ser sujeta y obediente a su marido, después de casada, tiene fuerza para obligarla por virtud de la ordenación divina.

Vicente Mexía, Saludable instrucción del matrimonio, 1566, ff. 44v-45r.

Mexía's treatise is important. Whereas writers like Ossuna and Luján had only allowed an increased concern with the "human" side of marriage to excuse, to some extent, the man who married beneath himself, this work was now showing that a woman who did the same might also meet with fewer accusations of the "debasement of lineage" variety, and more constructive advice on the subject of harmonious conjugal living.

#### Changes in the Progenital Precepts Themselves

It is impossible to tell whether the gradual relaxation apparent in the genetical "rules" of status determination was a result of the increasing concern with more personal aspects of marriage, or vice versa. The two processes may well have interacted on each other. However, it is clear that many of the Golden Age theorists of nobility, influenced, no doubt, by the instability of the contemporary aristocracy, were much less concerned than Alfonso el Sabio had been, with the need to establish and maintain a thoroughbred élite for the benefit of future generations. For example, Juan de Guardiola overrules Alfonso's stipulation about the offspring of the noblewoman and the commoner with a tolerant "me parece que él que fuere de madre noble, aunque su padre no sea tal, no dejara de ser en alguna manera noble" (Tratado de nobleza, 1591, f. 21<sup>v</sup>). A few years later his judgement was to receive some enthusiastic backing from Pedro Sáenz de Varrón: "Aunque conforme al rigor del derecho común no se imprima la nobleza por parte de la madre... muy bien hacen algunos que presumen de nobles, aunque sus padres no sean tales... porque de la nobleza de las madres participan en alguna manera" (Grandeza, valor y nobleza de España, f. 40<sup>r</sup>).<sup>18</sup>

Naturally enough, the relaxation of those technical



"rules" which made specific reference to the children of an unequal marriage, brought with it a more flexible attitude to the mésalliance itself. Instead of Alfonso's stern decree that the nobleman who marries beneath himself forfeits his status, we find Guardiola saying "cuando una mujer que antes era plebeya se casa con algún noble, al mismo punto es hecha noble" (Juan de Guardiola, Tratado de nobleza, 1591, f. 7<sup>r</sup>). Some thirty years later, Moreno de Vargas was taking Guardiola's new "rule" several steps further. He seems to have viewed certain kinds of unequal marriage with a degree of acceptance which must have made the Wise King turn in his grave:

Siendo la mujer que casare con hombre plebeyo reina, duquesa, marquesa o condesa, entonces no sólo no pierde su nobleza, mas por ella la consigue su marido... de donde se colige cuán conforme a razón es lo que los reyes de España han hecho en conceder hidalguías a los que casaren con mujeres hidalgas.

Bernarbé Moreno de Vargas, Discursos de la nobleza de España, 1622, ff. 17r-17v.

All in all, then, there can be little doubt that, between the middle of the sixteenth and the start of the seventeenth century, the progenital technicalities which had previously been so central to the subject of marriage, were beginning to make way for new, "human" priorities: freedom in the choice of a marriage partner, romantic love as a possible basis for marriage and the weighting of personal equality between man and wife. With the growth of so many fresh perspectives on the marital topic, it is not surprising that, in time, even the man who married out of class for money or social advancement began to acquire a few partisans.

#### Evidence of Support for the Materialistic Mésalliance

There is reason to suppose that, even in the sixteenth century, some Spaniards would have sympathized with the more humane motives which might lead parents to arrange socially advantageous matches for their children.

One of Santa Cruz's witty sayings starts from the assumption that a father will naturally think in terms of wealth and social position when he is "doing his best" by his daughter: "El padre que tiene hija de veinte años la ha de dar a otro mejor que él; y si es de veinticinco años, a otro tan bueno como él; y de ahí adelante, a quien se le pidiere" (Melchor de Santa Cruz y Dueñas, Floresta española, 1574, ed. H. López de Yanguas, p. 163). Moreover, as early as 1529 Antonio de Guevara was using the (alleged) authority of Alexander the Great to back up the view of marriage as a practical partnership in which the rich man's money-making abilities and the poor woman's thriftiness could complement each other in a beautiful economic harmony: "En los casamientos harta abasta que el marido sea rico y la mujer que tomare sea sabia, porque el oficio del marido es ganar lo perdido, y el oficio de la mujer es conservar lo ganado" (Antonio de Guevara, El reloj de príncipes y libro de Marco Aurelio, 1529, f. 83<sup>r</sup>).

These indications of sympathy towards the notion of reasonable materialism in marriage were not typical of the sixteenth century. By and large, commentators of this period equated the desire for a socially advantageous match with greed, and inveighed heavily against it. However, it is clear from Oliva Sabuco's Nueva filosofía de la naturaleza that, by 1588, the new admiration for shrewd application and "honourable materialism" was beginning to make itself felt, even in the sacred sphere of marriage. This pragmatic medical writer advises parents to take their sons-in-law from the ranks of the poor but bright, rather than from those of the rich but dull: "Es mejor casarla con hombre que no con vacas y ovejas, que la hacienda, éste la pierde por su poco saber y sus hijos bestias, y el otro la gana, él y sus hijos, con su buen juicio" (Oliva Sabuco, Nueva filosofía de la naturaleza, 1588, f. 169<sup>v</sup>).

Of course, once the seventeenth century, with its anti-idealistic trends, was in full swing, marital advice of this kind was given more frequently. By 1620, for example, Antonio Liñán y Verdugo was sufficiently confident of the acceptability of his pragmatic view



of marriage to pay only the merest lip service to the "toma tu igual" tradition. His main point, in fact, is that in the ideal society a young man would be right to arrange his own marriage on a materialistic basis:

Os confieso que si el mundo estuviera de otra suerte, que era aventajada cosa salir un hombre de una aldea y casarse en lugar como Madrid... Gran cosa es casarse un hombre en buena tierra, y ser hacendado en ella, para que allí se origine su casa y linaje, y esté a pique de las buenas fortunas que pueden ofrecérsele.

Antonio Liñán y Verdugo, Guía y aviso de forasteros (1620), f. 116r.

Equally indicative of the changing times was Mateo de Velázquez's perspective. He seems to have seen no harm in applying to the topic of marriage those same down-to-earth values which he had applied to the notions of money-making and social climbing. His exemplary tale about a farmer of the old school who refuses to marry his daughter to a "gentilhombre rico y heredado", is followed by the revealing comment "pues fue tan necio el testarudo aldeano, que pudiendo mejorar su linaje y casa..." (Baltasar Mateo de Velázquez, El filósofo del aldea, 1626, ed. E. Cotarelo y Mori, p. 205). Evidently, the standard "toma tu igual" maxim was, by the mid-seventeenth century, fighting a losing battle against the kind of sentiments which had produced its ironic variant "toma tu igual y véte a mendigar".

It is clear that the unequal marriage was, like the associated upstart problem, an important, many-sided and controversial topic, from the end of the fifteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century. Some might justifiably disagree with the conclusion that these revolutionary social phenomena met with a steady increase of acceptance and approval during these years. However, I would maintain that there is enough evidence of conflicting attitudes shown towards the upstart and the unequal couple for us to reconsider the traditional assumption that Spain was rigidly conservative insofar as questions of social evolution were concerned. Bearing this in mind, we should pass on to a consideration of the mésalliance and the social climber in Lope's theatre.

Footnotes to Chapter V

1. Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, La sociedad española en el siglo XVII (Madrid, 1963), and The Golden Age of Spain, 1516-1659, trans. James Casey (London, 1971); J.H. Elliott, Imperial Spain, 1469-1716 (London, 1963); John Lynch, Spain under the Habsburgs, 2 vols (Oxford, 1965-1969); Jaime Vicens Vives, Historia social y económica de España y América, 4 vols (Barcelona, 1957-1959), and Manual de historia económica de España (Barcelona, 1964); Juan Beneyto Pérez, Historia social de España y Hispanoamérica (Madrid, 1961); Albert A. Sicroff, Les Controverses des Statuts de "pureté de sang" en Espagne du XV<sup>e</sup> au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle (Paris, 1960).
2. Noël Salomon (Recherches sur le thème paysan dans la "comedia" au temps de Lope de Vega, Bordeaux, 1965) and R.O. Jones ("Poets and Peasants", in Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez, Madrid, 1971, 341-355) have already answered some of these questions with reference to the social position of the rich peasant. I shall not duplicate the work of these scholars, but shall try to apply their conclusions in examining the case of the merchant and the white-collar worker.
3. See, for example, John Lynch, Spain under the Habsburgs, 2 vols (Oxford, 1965-1969), II, p. 131, and Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, The Golden Age of Spain, 1516-1659, trans. James Casey (London, 1971), pp. 112-113.
4. All quotations from Las siete partidas are taken from the edition made by El Doctor Montalvo, Seville, 1491.
5. This treatise (MS. 5732, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid) is, in fact, undated. It was once thought that the author of the prologue, Leonardo Areccio, wrote the whole work. However, the anonymous scribe who recopied it at the start of this century brought forward evidence to show that it was almost certainly written in the



fifteenth century by Prince Don Carlos.

6. The most important of these sumptuary laws were passed in 1538, 1551 and 1564. The 1551 pragmática states that certain sectors ("oficiales menestrales de manos, sastres, zapateros...") are forbidden to wear certain materials, including silk, brocade and gold, "como caso que tanto importa al bien de la cosa pública".
7. For a detailed summary of the rich peasant and the land crisis see R.O. Jones, "Poets and Peasants", Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez (Madrid, 1971), 341-355, particularly pp. 344-348.
8. This particular view is held by historians like David Ogg (Europe in the Seventeenth Century, sixth edition, London, 1952, p. 12), and Ferdinand Braudel (La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen, Paris, 1966, p. 616).
9. See A.L. Rowse, The England of Elizabeth: the Structure of Society (London, 1964); Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965), and Social Change and Revolution in England, 1560-1640, ed. Lawrence Stone (London, 1965); C.A. Patrides, "The Scale of Nature and Renaissance Treatises on Nobility", Studia Neophilologica, XXXVI (1964), 63-68; Peter Burke, Culture and Society in Renaissance Italy, 1420-1540 (London, 1972); Renaissance Venice, ed. J.R. Hale (London, 1973); James Cushman Davis, The Decline of the Venetian Nobility as a Ruling Class (Baltimore, 1962); Roger Doucet, Les Institutions de la France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle (Paris, 1948); Henri Lapeyre, Une Famille de marchands: les Ruiz (Paris-Bordeaux, 1955).
10. See Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965), and Peter Burke, Culture and Society in Renaissance Italy, 1420-1540 (London, 1972).
11. See Davis Bitton, The French Nobility in Crisis, 1560-1640 (California, 1969).

12. This treatise was, in fact, first published in 1585, but it continued to be reprinted - unmodified - until 1665. I quote from one of the earlier seventeenth-century editions.
13. James Cushman Davis, The Decline of the Venetian Nobility as a Ruling Class (Baltimore, 1962), p. 76.
14. See R. H. Tawney, "The Rise of the Gentry, 1558-1640", Economic History Review, XI (1941), 1-38; H. R. Trevor-Roper, "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century", Past and Present, XVIII (1960), 8-42; G. E. Aylmer, "Office-Holding as a Factor in English History, 1625-1642", History, XLIV (1959), 228-240; Lawrence Stone, Social Change and Revolution in England, 1560-1640 (London, 1965), xi-xxvi.
15. This treatise (MS. 1446, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid) is undated. However, it must have been written in the first part of the sixteenth century, because Téllez de Meneses died in 1569.
16. For biographical details of Juan Latino and Francisco de los Cobos, see V. B. Spratlin, Juan Latino, Slave and Humanist (New York, 1938), and Hayward Keniston, Francisco de los Cobos: Secretary of the Emperor Charles V (Pittsburgh, 1960).
17. This is an undated manuscript (MS. 10725-10726, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid). Again, we can only suppose that it was written sometime before Arce y Otalora's death, in the mid-sixteenth century.
18. Sáenz de Varrón's work is an undated manuscript (MS. 3260, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid). It would seem to belong to the latter part of Philip III's reign (which lasted from 1578 to 1621). The royal genealogy at the end of the work finishes with the following entries:



Felipe III...que Dios guarde muchos años - difunto.  
Felipe IV ...que Dios guarde muchos años.

It seems likely, therefore, that Sáenz de Varrón finished the work before Philip III died, and then added the last entry at a later date.

19. See Ruth Pike, Aristocrats and Traders; Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century (Cornell, 1972), p. 87. She applies this generalization to the whole of Spain.

20. "Necon et alii summum laudis gradum Bartholomaeo adjudicant: in quibus Franciscus Sanctius Brocensis in arte discendi brevi tempore Latinam linguam, venacule conscripta, virum doctissimum, atque in linguis omnibus perfectissimum appellat" (Nicolás Antonio, Bibliotheca hispana, Matriti, 1788, I, p. 194).

21. The standard back door for theologians writing on this subject is neatly summed up by Juan de Ávila. In speaking against "pride of lineage" he shows a definite tendency to apply the "all men are equal" precept, in a concrete, social sense. However, as soon as he reaches the dangerous point, marked by the words "así el rico como el pobre", he takes refuge in the commonplace that social rank is less important than spiritual equality:

El linaje de carne terrena es oscurecido con el resplandor de la celestial honra... los que eran antes desiguales por honras del mundo, son igualmente vestidos con nobleza de honra celestial.

Juan de Ávila, Avisos y reglas cristianas sobre aquel verso de David, "Audi, filia" (1556), ed. Luis Salas Balust, p. 244.

22. I refer to Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965).

23. See Américo Castro, El pensamiento de Cervantes (Madrid, 1925); Marcel Bataillon, "Matrimonios cervantinos. Ortodoxia humana", Realidad, II (1947), 171-182, and

"Cervantes et le mariage chrétien", Bulletin Hispanique, XLIX (1947), 129-144; Justina Ruiz de Conde, El amor y el matrimonio secreto en los libros de caballerías (Madrid, 1948); A. González de Amezúa y Mayo, Cervantes, creador de la novela corta española, 2 vols (Madrid, 1956), I, 212-243; Roberto V. Piluso, Amor, matrimonio y honra en Cervantes (New York, 1967); Paul M. Descousiz, "El matrimonio en el 'Quijote' - influjo tridentino", Torre, LXIV (1969), 34-35.

24. The Protestants, in fact, used the term "clandestine marriage" to mean a marriage contracted without parental consent, as well as a secret marriage (G.H. Joyce, Christian Marriage: an Historical and Doctrinal Study, London, 1948, p. 72).

25. Justina Ruiz de Conde, El amor y el matrimonio secreto en los libros de caballerías (Madrid, 1948), pp. 98-130.



## Chapter VI

### The Social Issues Dramatized

The extent to which the Lopean comedia concerned itself with the serious social issues of its age has become a controversial question. Almost every arguable case has been argued: the utter unreality of Golden Age comedy (R.O. Jones), its fusion of real-life and literary elements (N. Salomon), its real social role as an instrument of right-wing propaganda (J.A. Maravall y Casenoves), its life-based championship of common man (F.C. Hayes), its impartial and comic-serious exposition of contemporary class problems (J.W. Sage).<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this study is to support the view that a large number of Lope's plays do hinge on conflicts and dilemmas which a seventeenth-century audience would have recognized as topical in the extreme. To this end, I wish to emphasize the close parallels between the arguments put forward by Lope's upstarts and unequal lovers, and the notions most central to serious contemporary discussions of marriage and social evolution.

### Topical Views and Familiar Phrases

We have already seen that the growth of wealth as a new criterion of nobility constituted a major challenge to the adaptability of social theorists throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A popular awareness of the significance of this phenomenon produced the ubiquitous catchphrase dineros son calidad. The repeated use which Lope's characters make of this very expression would therefore suggest an element of social commentary. Whether the phrase is uttered with bitterness, as in La burgalesa de Lerma, with gleeful materialism, as in La niña de plata and El caballero de Illescas, or simply with thoughtful appraisal, as in the play actually called Los dineros son calidad, the same conclusion is inevitable. Lope was writing about the

conflict of values which lay at the heart of the contemporary class war:

Pues se ha visto  
ser de los dineros causa  
la calidad, por ser ellos  
de todas las cosas almas.  
Los dineros son calidad, Ac.N.XII, 35b.

A similarly close association between life and literature is to be deduced from the frequency with which stage figures borrow from the marital writers of the age stock platitudes on the subjects of freedom in marriage, and marriage out of class. The heroine of Querer la propia desdicha, for example, echoes almost word for word the anti-mésalliance arguments of Pedro de Luján and Francisco de Ossuna:

Si de un casamiento igual  
se engendra amor, yo no espero,  
si tan desigual le quiero,  
menos que amor desigual.  
Querer la propia desdicha, Ac.N.XIII, 456a.

Even more pointedly, the heated debates of La noche de San Juan seem to have been designed, in part, as a reminder of the increased abhorrence of enforced marriage in this post-Tridentine age:

¿Si dejar por su marido  
casa y padre es ley del cielo,  
¿a quién ofendo en dejarlo  
pues al cielo obedezco?  
La noche de San Juan, Ac.N.VIII, 151b.

Close parallels and direct references of this kind are, in fact, legion in Lope's theatre, providing a solid basis for opposition to the argument that the comedia was an escapist art form. Moreover, certain groups of plays - notably the peasant and the secretarial comedias - declare their own social relevance, by stimulating a consideration of some of the most controversial viewpoints of the age.<sup>2</sup>



The Secretary Play

That Lope was, himself, aware of a process of artistic distortion at work in his portrayals of the secretarial servant is evident from a joke which he makes at his own expense in Los nobles como han de ser:

Afuera vil cobardía,  
que en comedias jamás vi  
un secretario que así  
tuviese la lengua fría;  
antes todos atrevidos  
suelen echarse al través,  
y apenas se pasa un mes  
cuando pasan a maridos.  
Los nobles como han de ser, Ac.N.VIII, 107b.

However, the fact that the Lopean secretary was more daring, and more successful in scaling the social heights than his real-life counterpart, did not prevent the Jesuit commentator, Agustín de Herrera, from regarding him as a potentially dangerous example: "El criado logra los favores y la mano de la señora...y como haya amor, ingenio y discreción, tiene mérito y logra el más loco atrevimiento. ¿Qué es todo esto sino quitar el horror a la livianidad, autorizar la osadía, acreditar de discreto lo indecoroso?"<sup>3</sup> His objections are not as far-fetched as they might seem. We have already seen that progressive social theorists were increasingly inclined to regard practical qualities as more important than noble status in candidates for offices of social leadership, and plays like El perro del hortelano, El secretario de sí mismo and El silencio agradecido feature non-noble secretaries who win themselves aristocratic wives and positions of real social authority, precisely by showing a practical aptitude for cunning and boldness:

Con igualdad nos tratemos,  
como suelen los señores,  
pues todos lo somos ya.  
El perro del hortelano, ed. A.D. Kossoff,  
III. 3165-3167.

Small wonder, then, that Herrera was particularly worried by the audacity of the theatrical secretary; the knowledge that such an attribute might win a real learned upstart support from some quarters must have made him feel that, in this case, fiction was little stranger than fact.

Even more redolent of subversive implication is Lope's tongue-in-cheek Servir a señor discreto. This play evolves with caricaturesque precision the popular image of the secretary as propagated by theoretical writers on white-collar servitude:

Conde	¿Qué es a un secretario necesario?
Gerardo	Saber cinco o seis lenguas.
Conde	El las sabe.
Gerardo	¿Tiene estilo elegante?
Conde	Culto y vario.
Gerardo	¿La frase es fácil?
Conde	Y el hablar es grave.
Gerardo	<u>¿Luego imita al señor?</u>
Conde	<u>Divinamente.</u>
	El hablar y escribir,
	ésa es la llave.
Gerardo	¿No ha de ser leal?
Conde	Partes forzosas
	son el secreto y la lealtad.
	<u>Servir a señor discreto</u> , Ac.XV, 598a.

The words underlined are particularly interesting in that they recall a point much emphasized by Barrio Ángulo: the duty of the secretary to imitate - unobtrusively but closely - the manners of his master: "Es en el concepto, voz y mano, sombra del señor" (Gabriel Pérez del Barrio Ángulo, Dirección de secretarios de señores, 1613, f. 4<sup>v</sup>). Significantly, however, this real-life notion about secretarial conduct backfires when put into theatrical action. The servant, through serving (and imitating) a discreet master, advances so far in refinement and fortune, that he finishes by marrying the latter's fiancée, and by competing with him in gallant generosity. Obviously, Lope's purposes are a mixture of the social and the artistic, and this play takes the el papel hace al hombre principle to an extreme which would seem to belong to the stage more than to real life. Nevertheless, the mischievous interpretation which it puts upon



the popular secretary image can scarcely have failed to suggest the fallibility of the traditional belief in inimitable noble virtues, and the justifiability - both moral and social - of the learned upstart's claim to noble status.

### Non-humorous Comedy

It is difficult to refute roundly the contention that laughter left little room in Lope's comic theatre for serious thought, because we can really do no more than guess at how funny the comedia actually was on the seventeenth-century stage. However, the argument that it was essentially a comic-serious form seems to me to be applicable to most of the class-based plays which I have read, and I shall pass on later to an examination of some of the techniques which allowed Lope to explore social topics in a humorous way. Nevertheless, I should like to begin by making the point that one occasionally comes across a comedia which does not appear to have any comic potential at all. Nardo Antonio, bandolero, Carlos el perseguido, La fuerza lastimosa and El perro del hortelano, for example, all tackle the issues surrounding the mésalliance against a background of murder, threats and treachery. In every case, the enredos which R.O. Jones has seen as fundamental to the frivolity of the seventeenth-century comic theatre,<sup>4</sup> breathe unease and tension, rather than laughter. Furthermore, the fact that theatrical commentators and theorists of literature showed an increasing tendency to regard suspense as an integral part of the comedia, strengthens my conviction that the serious issues broached in Lope's theatre were recognized as such by his own age, and that the sensation of intense disquiet provoked by the dramatic presentation of them, was even accepted, on occasion, as a satisfactory substitute for the traditional comic criterion of laughter.

As early as 1596, El Pinciano noted that the contemporary comedia (a term which he here uses to mean "comedy") was provoking some non-comic reactions in

the auditorium: "Sí, algunos oyentes hay tan blandos de carona, que lloran en comedias" (Filosofía antigua poética, 1596, p.382). A few years later another attempt to account for the same phenomenon produced the conclusion that the theatrical experience of comedy could be, in fact, quite a nerve-wracking business: "[La comedia y la tragedia] al principio entran lentamente y suspendiendo los ánimos, y luego se van perturbando y marañando, crece más la perturbación hasta la parte que dice la catástrofe, y la soltura y el añudamiento y perturbación, de la cual fábula está la suspensión y en la soltura lo alegre y satisfactorio del entendimiento" (Juan Martí, Segunda parte de la vida del pícaro Guzmán de Alfarache, 1602, cit. Cotarelo y Mori, p.440). Finally, it seems that, by the time Lope's theatre was in full swing, suspense and perturbación figured prominently among those qualities supposed to give a comedia its box-office appeal:

[Procuran] siempre tener el ánimo de los oyentes suspenso, ya alegres, ya tristes, ya admirados, y con deseo de saber el fin de los sucesos.

Luis Alfonso de Cavallo, El cisne de Apolo, 1602.

Porque destas circunstancias el énfasis que se muestra suspende, y la suspensión de un cabello al vulgo cuelga.

Carlos Boyl, A un licenciado que deseaba hacer comedias, 1616.

Clearly, the seventeenth-century theatre-goer expected more for his money than laughter alone. The growing appreciation of suspense as a dramatic ingredient which could either take the place of, or combine with, lighter-hearted elements, might be said to indicate, at the most, the existence of a non-humorous strain in the Golden Age comedia, and at the very least, the fallibility of the theory that frivolity was its norm. Since the latter part of this conclusion is, for our purposes, the more important, it may be profitable to pinpoint briefly some of the methods by which Lope appears to have achieved a comic effect without a diminishment of serious implication.



The Tragicomic Approach

Judging from what I have read, the disguise and variation-on-a-theme techniques provide the most common bases for a tragi-comic exposition of social issues in Lope's theatre. In many plays, of course - Los novios de Hornachuelos and El piadoso veneciano might stand as examples - the same socially-relevant situation is simply exploited in serious manner by the primary plot, and in comic vein by the subplot. More complex works, like Pedro de Urdemalas and Los hidalgos del aldea, allow events to illustrate the serious implications of the "new noble" question, but ensure that the same issue yields a maximum of comic potential by expounding its pros and cons in farcical debate scenes:

Jofre	Los dineros son calidad... Y, pues ¿no somos todos hijos de Adán?
Celedón	¿Luego a vuestra calidad de esa suerte iguales fuimos y en el mundo nadie hubiera que a los demás gobernara.
Teodora	¡Oh, qué donosa quistión! <u>Los hidalgos del aldea</u> , Ac.N.VI, 291a-291b.

The comic-serious purport of these variation-on-a-theme works is probably more self-evident than that of the disguised aristocrat plays. Indeed, it has been argued that the fairy-tale connotations of the long-lost noble suggest a deliberately escapist streak in the Golden Age comedia.<sup>5</sup> This contention fails, however, to take account of the "nobility will out" and "like-to-like" precepts as established traditions which were very real for the seventeenth century. Hence, it misses an important point: when, as in Los prados de León or Las almenas de Toro, for example, a long-lost noble unwittingly reveals his aristocratic fighting temper, or "coincidentally" falls in love with a disguised noblewoman, he is enacting some of the real-life concepts against which the nouveau riche was struggling:

Bien me lo pensaba yo,  
 bien me lo dijo tu cara,  
 el resplandor de tu honra...  
 que como luz que traspasa  
 el vidrio, el alma te vi.  
Las almenas de Toro, Ac. VIII, 108a.

More disturbingly, the hilarious intermingling of peasants and disguised aristocrats in plays like Amor secreto hasta celos, La esclava de su galán and Por la puente Juana, produces predicaments in which the noble behaves in a significantly less dignified way than the peasant. Also, the impressive Al pasar del arroyo furnishes a good example of the tendency of the money/nobility issue to be forever forcing its way through the apparently unreal situations of the disguise play:

Don Carlos	Conozco la calidad de Jacinta; mas, ¿qué hacienda, para hacella vuestra prenda, tenéis con seguridad?...
Don Luis	La hacienda de su hermosura me tiene más obligado. Pero, como natural Jacinta, y que fue su madre más principal que su padre... <u>Al pasar del arroyo, BAE. XXIV, 402a.</u>

Obviously, a detailed examination of Lope's tragi-comic methods would demand a study all to itself. It is sufficient to note here, however, that the majority of his class-based comedias rely on rapid manipulation of mood, and on double-edged methods - like that of the disguise, and variation-on-a-theme techniques - which can be used to draw from the comic situation a serious implication, and from the serious issue a humorous perspective.

#### The Crux of the Upstart's Dilemma

I have already noted that Lope's class-based theatre has been associated with every conceivable social viewpoint, including absolute neutrality. My own feeling is that, while the dramatist seems to be wholeheartedly "progressive" in his support of the unequal



love match, he does tend to "weigh up", rather than to take sides, on the social climbing issue. Nevertheless, it is possible to glimpse behind his assessments of both individual mésalliances and individual upstarts, two constant criteria, which might be classed as universal, rather than as merely topical. His social climbers are undoubtedly meant to be judged on their understanding of "everyman's dignity". It is well known, of course, that the notion of self-respect, based on a concern for personal integrity, rather than on an obsession with social status, is important in Lope's theatre generally. In the upstart plays, particularly, this ideal seems to be closely linked with the contemporary Christian argument of universal equality:

Tengo en esta ropa pobre  
un alma de oro tan rico  
que lo que la vuestra aplica  
puedo convertir en pobre.  
El dómíne Lucas, Ac.N.XII, 86b.

A whole host of plays, including El Conde Fernán González, El rey por semejanza and El caballero de Illescas, imply that the social climber who works from this basis deserves support and success:

Por no perderle a mi padre  
el respeto natural  
dejo el humilde sayo...  
Yo soy un hombre bajo  
con bríos de caballero.  
El rey por semejanza, Ac.N.II, 499a.

Others, like La necedad del discreto, El caballero del milagro and Nardo Antonio, bandolero, would seem to suggest that it is the degeneration of this personal dignity into blind presumption which makes the upstart unworthy of social promotion:

Que Laureano, por necio  
le haga curar su locura...  
Tú, Celio, discreto y sabio,  
harás noble casamiento  
con Camila, y de Ferrara  
tendrás por dote el gobierno.  
La necedad del discreto, Ac.N.VIII, 66b.

In point of fact, this distinction between the dignity of common man and the arrogance of common man is fundamental to a wide variety of issues within Lope's class-based theatre. The question of where honour ends, and where presumption begins, for example, is posed by the uprisings of Fuenteovejuna and El genovés liberal. Similarly, the twin plays, La quinta de Florencia and El villano en su rincón, employ parallel characters and situations in their demonstrations of the proximity of self-assurance and complacency. When the two plays are taken together, it is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that the rustic protagonist of La quinta de Florencia stands on the right side of the border, while Juan Labrador oversteps the limits of "everyman's dignity":

Que en aqueste molino derribado  
soy más bueno que tú cuarenta veces  
en tu quinta pintada y llena de armas;  
que esta harina que cubre estas puertas  
es más limpia que el oro de las tuyas.  
La quinta de Florencia, Ac. XV, 383a.

Yo he sido rey, Feliciano,  
en mi pequeño rincón;  
reyes los que viven son  
del trabajo de su mano;  
rey es quien con pecho sano  
descansa sin ver al rey.  
El villano en su rincón, ed. J. de Entrambasaguas,  
I. 476-481.

Clearly, then, it is highly significant that a graduation from humility to dignified self-assertion earns the hero of El silencio agradecido, for example, a position of social authority, while a boastful application of the Christian equality argument in El caballero del milagro meets with true poetic justice when Luzmán is finally left naked in the street:

¡Ah, si durara el estado  
de nuestros padres primeros  
que andando todos en cueros,  
se viera el mejor formado!  
El caballero del milagro, Ac. N. IV, 146a.



Lope's upstart plays, with their fine distinctions between dignity and arrogance, presumption and self-assurance, constitute what is, perhaps, the most socially-relevant variation on a basic theme of his theatre - everyman's right to a sense of personal honour.

### Lope's Unequal Lovers

In support of the statement that Lope's theatre is more biased in its dealings with the mésalliance than in its portrayals of the social climber, one might quote the fact that there are very few plays which shed an unflattering light on the unequal marriage. It is true that La discordia en los casados and La niña de plata link the concept of the mismatch with that of the materialistic enforced union. It is much more usual, however, for "true love" to win hands down over the traditional notion that marriage out of class redounds to the dishonour of the aristocratic partner. Generally speaking, the arguments which Lope's unequal lovers bring out in their own defence are based on the notions that virtue rates above worldly attributes in a prospective partner, and that love, as a force, overrules everything, including social codes:

...es verdad  
que es pobre, y en calidad  
desigual a quien eres tú.  
Pero es luz de las mujeres  
en virtud y honestidad.  
Laura perseguida, Ac.N.VII, 117a.

El más alto poder  
que reconoce la tierra,  
el cetro, la monarquía,  
la corona, la grandeza  
del mayor rey de los hombres...  
es amor.  
La moza de cántaro, ed. C. González Echegaray,  
III. 2614-2622.

As the above extracts would imply, there is little suggestion of the unequal marriage as an "unnatural" phenomenon which upsets the proper order of things.

In fact, it is quite common for both unequal lovers and impartial observers to uphold the principle that man-made codes are, themselves, out of tune with the workings of nature, when they seek to obstruct the course of true love:

...que es en vano  
poner a los gustos leyes.  
Ellos se quieren, y es ley  
que ellos se gocen.  
Los prados de León, Ac.VII, 183a.

This overall impression of the natural propriety of the love-based mésalliance is strengthened by Lope's tendency to emphasize a Platonic element in the bond between his unequal lovers. In plays like El perseguido, Laura perseguida and Pedro de Urdemalas, love-at-first-sight combines with a portrayal of passion as a mixture of the extremely physical and the extremely spiritual, to produce a definite sense of inevitability:

Debíamos de soñar  
un mismo sueño los dos,  
y lo que os despertó a vos  
me debió de despertar,  
de suerte que a un tiempo aquí  
nos hallamos abrazados.  
Pedro de Urdemalas, Ac.N.VIII, 393b.

As if to counteract, furthermore, real-life objections to romantic love as loco amor, the heroine of Las flores de don Juan, y rico y pobre trocados makes it very clear that her love-based mésalliance is a result of much careful thought:

Casáronme mis ojos, mis oídos,  
mi voluntad, mi propio sentimiento  
al consejo de todos mis sentidos.  
No tan precipitados, ni atrevidos  
que los cegase un loco pensamiento.  
Las flores de don Juan, y rico y pobre trocados,  
Ac.N.XII, 202a.

It would seem, then, that Lope's theatre lends its unqualified support not only to the notion of freely-chosen marriage, but also to the love-based mésalliance.



The arguments and attitudes which constitute his defence of this kind of union almost all have their roots in the real-life ideas of the age. Nevertheless, as in the case of the upstart plays, the topical issues involved are usually related to a more fundamental problem - the personal equality of man and woman. I shall deal elsewhere with the "battle of the sexes" as a central Lopean theme. It is relevant to note here, however, that plays like El silencio agradecido, El perro del hortelano and El rey por semejanza work out in dramatic terms one of the most frequent contemporary objections to the notion of a man's marrying above himself: female domination in the partnership. Invariably Lope's answer to the dilemma seems to be that once a man and a woman have solved the equality problem on this fundamental, sexual level, disparity of social status becomes irrelevant:

Vime, cual digo, tu igual  
y arrojéme a idolatrarte.  
El rey por semejanza, Ac.N.II, 508b.

The Conclusions as Applied to El mayordomo de la  
Duquesa de Amalfi

That Lope should have used the Amalfi theme as the basis for a tragic exposition of the issues surrounding the upstart and the mésalliance furnishes additional evidence for the argument that he intended links in this sphere between social reality and dramatic action. Neither he nor his contemporaries questioned the traditional precept that tragedy should deal with truth. Certainly, Antonio is not a successful upstart. Unlike the protagonists of El perro del hortelano or El servir a señor discreto, for example, he never learns the audacity or "common dignity" which would rid him of his servant mentality and fit him for a position of social leadership. However, his failure to do so does not imply that El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is concerned in a less controversial way than

other upstart plays with real social issues. In fact, many members of a seventeenth-century audience must have been aware that even in his professional capacity Antonio should have been used to exercising some degree of authority: "El oficio de mayordomo pide hombre hidalgo, anciano y de autoridad" (Gabriel Pérez del Barrio Ángulo, Dirección de secretarios de señores, 1613, f. 176<sup>v</sup>). Furthermore, the Duchess's repeated requests that Antonio exchange reticence for boldness do not only express her personal frustration, but also suggest that this learned servant might, with the dramatist's blessing, have been more whole-hearted in his defiance of class barriers.

It goes almost without saying, of course, that our play shares with the majority of Lope's mésalliance works a favourable attitude towards the unequal marriage based on love. Despite the (ultimately catastrophic) reversal of sexual roles on which it is founded, the Duchess's marriage numbers among the most loving and fertile in Lope's theatre. Furthermore, the portrayal of its opposers as villains, the particular barbarity of the infanticides, and the exemplary nature of the rustic subplot all emphasize the wicked absurdity of a social code which insists on the destruction of so much good. All in all, therefore, this play may be justifiably included amongst those which demonstrate most plainly the serious purposes, and, to some extent, the subversive implications inherent in Lope's specifically social expositions of the "man/woman" and "common dignity" themes.



Footnotes to Chapter VI

1. R.O. Jones, "El perro del hortelano y la visión cómica de Lope", Filología, X (1964), 135-142; Noël Salomon, Recherches sur le Thème Paysan dans la "Comedia" au Temps de Lope de Vega (Bordeaux, 1965); J.A. Maravall y Casenoves, Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca (Madrid, 1972); F.C. Hayes, "Lope de Vega and the Common Man", in South Atlantic Studies for Sturgis E. Leavitt, ed. T.B. Stroup and S.A. Stoudmire (New York, 1972), 71-79; J.W. Sage, "The Context of Comedy: Lope de Vega's El perro del hortelano and Related Plays", in Studies in Spanish Literature of the Golden Age. Presented to Edward M. Wilson, ed. R.O. Jones (London, 1973), 247-266. Also relevant are: Santiago Montoto, "Lope de Vega y la nobleza", Boletín de la Real Academia, XXI (1935), 657-665; R.O. Jones, "Poets and Peasants", in Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez (Madrid, 1971), 341-355; Frida Weber de Kurlat, "El perro del hortelano, comedia palatina", Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica, XXIV (1976), 339-363.
  
2. I pass over the topic of Lope's peasants as one which has been well covered by N. Salomon (Recherches sur le Thème Paysan dans la "Comedia" au Temps de Lope de Vega, Bordeaux, 1965), and R.O. Jones ("Poets and Peasants", in Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez, Madrid, 1971, 341-355).
  
3. Agustín de Herrera, Discurso teológico y político, 1682, cit. E. Cotarelo y Mori, Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España (Madrid, 1904), p. 356.
  
4. R.O. Jones, "El perro del hortelano y la visión cómica de Lope", Filología, X (1964), 135-142.
  
5. See J.A. Maravall y Casenoves, Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca (Madrid, 1972), p. 46.

The Amazon and the Fop

No mires a mi nobleza;  
habla como mi cabeza  
y no como mayordomo,  
habla como hombre.  
(El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi,  
I.431-434).

Thus pleads the determined heroine of Lope's tragedy, as she takes the active part, and her reticent lover the passive role, in their unorthodox courtship. Her words are not lacking in significance, for as the play progresses it is again the Duchess who organizes most of the intrigues which protect her union with Antonio, and at the moment of truth, it is she who stands up alone against her brother, having been deserted at the eleventh hour by her less-than-courageous husband. In fact, this play, like several others in Lope's repertoire, brings onto the stage a marriage between a strong woman and a weak man. Surprisingly, (in an age when traditional male dominance was consistently recommended to all married couples), the unorthodox weighting of the marital roles does not prevent the Duchess's match from being a happy one. Keeping this in mind, my purpose here will be to study the masculine woman and the effeminate man as a pair, in both the social thought of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spain, and in Lope's theatre. Much ground within this area has already been covered. The controversy about Lope's active women is a lively one, which has hinged largely on the questions of whether the masculine woman on the stage reflected seventeenth-century reality in any way, and whether she was approved of by the dramatist himself.

Julia Fitzmaurice Kelly and María del Pilar Oñate have both explored the feminist quarrel which raged in Spain from the Middle Ages onwards. The latter, particularly, emphasizes the predomination of a censorious attitude, in both life and literature, towards the masculine woman. M. Romera-Navarro, Barbara Matulka and R.O. Jones have



all argued - with varying degrees of emphasis - for the transvestite and the active woman as "unreal" features of Golden Age drama. Their approach has been counteracted, to some extent, by S.A. Vosters, who maintains that the learned ladies of Lope's theatre were a reflection of both contemporary reality and the dramatist's own feminist sympathies. Merveen M<sup>C</sup>Kendrick's study, the most recent and comprehensive survey of the topic, has upheld the thesis that Lope and his fellow dramatists did take account of real-life attitudes to feminism, but that while they sympathized, by and large, with woman's revolt against social restrictions, they were ultimately traditional in condemning any rejection on her part of "natural" dependence and femininity.<sup>1</sup>

The heroine of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is strong-minded and brave, rather than transvestite, learned or truly hombruna. Correspondingly, her husband is weak and cowardly, but not exaggeratedly effeminate. Consequently, this study will revolve more around questions of submission and dominance between men and women, than around the feminist debate, the problem of education for women, or the transvestite topic. Obviously, the majority of Spanish women did not dress up as men or demand the same standards of education as those prescribed for their male contemporaries, and the prevalence of the belief in innate male superiority certainly reduces the likelihood of widespread male transvestism during this period. However, Merveen M<sup>C</sup>Kendrick has already pointed out that Lope's theatre features many different kinds of active women, and that their relevance to seventeenth-century life lies less in their possible affinities with isolated examples of extreme feminism, than in their personification of certain attitudes intrinsic to the contemporary controversy about woman and her role. I begin to depart from Mrs. M<sup>C</sup>Kendrick's thesis only when it uses this premise as a basis for the argument that the active woman on the seventeenth-century stage was primarily a symbol of social revolt. I would argue, rather, that her masculine dress and/or behaviour is to be understood as part of a metaphorical enactment of a far more mundane "feminist" topic: the "battle of the sexes".



Intersexual Conflict as an Everyday Problem

There is, in fact, evidence to suggest that many didactic writers of the age were aware of the existence of both forceful women and men who were less than masculine in spirit. Take, for example, Alonso de Fuentes's calm acceptance and scientific explanation of these "unnatural" phenomena.

Cuando la simiente está en la madre...si está en la parte derecha que por el hígado es más caliente que la otra, hácese macho, y también si está en la parte izquierda que es fría, hácese hembra, y aun estando en la derecha, inclinándose a la izquierda, sale hombre femenil, y estando en la parte izquierda, si a la derecha se inclina, sale mujer que llamamos varonil.

(Suma de filosofía natural, 1547, f. 136<sup>r</sup>).

That this awareness was linked, above all, with the realization that the traditional marital ideal of masculine dominance and feminine submission was far from being a consistently achieved reality, may be gathered from Liñán y Verdugo's satire on marriage-guidance manuals (Guía y avisos de forasteros, 1620, escarmiento 12), from the fact that Francisco Jiménez entitled one of his chapters "Hay muchos casados que se aborrecen entre sí" (El carro de las donas, 1542), and from refranes like "Él que no tiene mujer, bien la castiga". Therefore, while it is almost certainly true that transvestism was not a common practice in seventeenth-century Spain, and that men and women did not normally seek to assume characteristics of the opposite sex, it would be difficult to deny either that the perennial fight for dominance between men and women was recognized as an everyday problem at this time, or that, in treating this topic, many Spaniards took into account the fact that some women had stronger personalities than some men. I shall return later to the relationship between this seventeenth-century awareness and some of the masculine women and effeminate men in Lope's theatre. It is first necessary, however, to examine in more detail the real-life attitudes towards strong women and weak men.



The Concept of Feminine Leadership

Once again, M<sup>C</sup> Melveena Kendrick has already shown that the idea of female domination and leadership, in a general social sense, was not consistently abhorred by sixteenth and seventeenth-century Spaniards. One might, in fact, take her observations one step further. Pedro de Mejía (Silva de varia lección, 1540) and Juan de Espinosa reach the ultimate point in sixteenth-century feminism when they argue that women in general are as tough, and as fit for social government, as are men:

Y en la misma especie del hombre, si las mujeres son ejercitadas en los peligros y trabajos, especialmente antes de ser fatigadas y enflaquecidas con la preñez y los partos, diversos ejemplos muestran no ser en fuerzas corporales inferiores a los varones; y mucho menos en fortaleza de ánimo, en ejercicio militar, en gobierno y heróicos hechos.

(Juan de Espinosa, Diálogo en laude de las mujeres, 1580, p. 162).

This acceptance of, and admiration for, the feminine capacity for social leadership must, of course, have had much to do with the kind of women rulers who were sitting, or who had recently sat, on the thrones of Spain and Spanish-dominated countries. The reign of Isabel I of Castile (1496-1504) was frequently held up as an exemplary era of Christian prosperity by Spaniards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and even foreigners commented on the efficiency of the Spanish queens Margarita of Austria and María of Hungary, both of whom had occasion to take over the government of the Netherlands during different periods of the sixteenth century:

Estos Países Bajos están gobernados ahora por la Reina Madre, María de Hungría, hermana del Emperador, dama de tanto espíritu y valor que bastaría para el gobierno de cualquier otro Estado porque es un espíritu infatigable, y en la práctica, tanto de la guerra como de la paz, ha mostrado sin duda reunir el valor de una mujer.

(Marino Cavalli, Relación, 1551, trans. and ed. J. García Mercadal, Madrid, 1959, I, p. 1051).

In point of fact, it appears that by the mid seventeenth century Spain had acquired a reputation for being something of a matriarchal society. French traveller Jean de Muret writes: "Si grand est maintenant l'empire des femmes pendant la regence [de Marie-Anne d'Autriche] que jusqu'aux divertissements de la chasse sont commis aux personnes du sexe; aussi dit-on que la Reine tire fort bien" (Lettres écrites de Madrid, 1666-67, ed. M.A. Morel-Fatio, Paris, 1877, p. 38). Certainly, the living proof which Spaniards had had of the effective leadership of some dominant women seems to have led more than one of them to the conclusion that noblewomen, at least, should not always be held subject to those rules of submission and acceptance usually prescribed for their sex. Already, in the fifteenth century, Mosén Diego de Valera tacks on to his praise of Isabel I the following comment: "Algunos querían decir... que [el gobierno] no pertenece a la reina, mas al rey su marido... lo cual es verdad generalmente en las mujeres; pero de la regla general son exemptadas las reinas, duquesas y señoras..." (Crónica de los Reyes Católicos, 1482-88, ed. Juan de M. Carriazo, I, p. 4). Similarly, F. Vicente Mejía grants that there are many situations in which a noblewoman might profitably be allowed to emerge sufficiently from her husband's grasp to take an equal part with him in the government of his estates:

Otra [razón] es la libre voluntad de su marido cuando, por especiales causas que para ello tuviese (no embargante que él sólo es suficiente por sí) quisiese dar parte a su mujer del dicho cargo, tomándola como para acompañada, agora fuese por hacerle favor, agora por partir su trabajo a medias, agora por tener confianza de su buen seso y discreción: creyendo que le ayudará fielmente y con provecho del mismo cargo.

(Saludable instrucción del estado de matrimonio, 1566, f. 272v).

Of course, all these indications of an acceptance of the woman who is masculine in spirit, or at least, strong in the sphere of leadership, come from writers who are dealing specifically with the management of state affairs. I do not know of any marital theorist who



actually advises men to let their wives "rule the roost". However, it seems inevitable that the awareness of feminine influence in social government should have lead some Spaniards to reconsider also the totally passive role traditionally allotted to women in domestic matters. After all, at a time when many matches were made with an eye to material benefits, the personal and practical aspects of marriage must surely have been closely linked. This supposition is borne out by Mateo de Prado, who suggests that even when noblewomen were not officially in charge of the family estates, they were still able to exert considerable social influence by the personal pressure which they could bring to bear on their husbands:

Los jueces, guerreros, príncipes, y todos los  
que se dejan señorear de sus mujeres,  
condescienden muchas veces a sus hálagos  
y tiranía, y no pueden los hombres entendidos  
dar de su ánimo varonil más noble muestra  
que no permitir a sus mujeres a que se mezclen  
en los negocios de justicia, estado y guerra.  
(El manual de los grandes, 1640, f. 5<sup>v</sup>).

As can be seen from the above extract, Prado's sceptical attitude towards the notion of feminine social leadership encourages him to disapprove also of the man who allows his wife to take the upper hand in their personal relationship. Nevertheless, his final words on the subject show that even he acknowledges the likelihood of this happening enough for there to be a practical compromise: "Deben los príncipes sabios, cuando aun condescudiesen en parte al complacimento de sus mujeres ocultar esta dependencia, para no abrir camino a la murmuración" (f. 18<sup>v</sup>). He seems to be suggesting that a wife can "wear the trousers" occasionally, so long as the world at large is not allowed to suspect that this is the case. The same idea appears to lie behind the kind words which many writers - both Spaniards and foreigners - find for the working partnership of the Catholic Monarchs. Nearly all commentators agree that Isabel was the dominant personality in this royal relationship: "Fernando de su natural condición era muy inclinado a hacer justicia, y también era piadoso...

y' era asimismo remitido a consejo, en especial de la reina su mujer, porque conocía su gran suficiencia" (Fernando del Pulgar, Crónica de los Reyes Católicos, ed. Juan de M. Carriazo, I, p. 75). Several of them also suggest that this was acceptable because the Queen always made it look as if her husband was at least as much in command as she: "pero de tal manera manda que siempre parezca hacerlo de acuerdo con su marido" (Pedro Mártir de Anglería, in a letter to Ascansio Visconti, 1488, Documentos inéditos para la historia de España, Madrid, 1953, IX, p. 40).

The very existence of this kind of attitude has important implications. The open acknowledgement of the need for a public lie to cover up a woman-dominated relationship would suggest a fairly matter-of-fact acceptance of the inevitability of such relationships. Therefore, while it would not be fair to say that the woman who dominated on a personal level met with widespread approval in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it could well be argued that her existence was generally accepted as a fact of life, and sometimes allowed for, in various ways. This does not mean to say, of course, that the weak or effeminate man - the one most likely to be ruled by his wife - managed to escape scornful criticism.

#### The Abhorrence of Extreme Effeminacy

Not surprisingly, the general belief in male superiority resulted in the notion that it was more shameful for a man to incline towards feminine weakness than for a woman to lean towards masculine strength: "Los hombres que han sido afeminados, han sido torpísimo vituperio del mundo. Las mujeres que han sido varoniles, siempre fueron milagrosa aclamación de los siglos; porque cuanto es de ignominia renunciar lo bueno que uno tiene, es de gloria renunciar lo malo y flaco" (Francisco de Quevedo, cit. O. H. Green, Courtly Love in Quevedo, University of Colorado Studies, 1952, p. 73). The idea of the homosexual - the most extreme kind of effeminate man - seems to have met with no tolerance



at all. Gregorio Marañón has shown that Enrique IV was condemned quite outrightly by many of his influential contemporaries and almost all of his chroniclers both because he was (supposedly) impotent, and because he was suspected of homosexuality<sup>2</sup>. In fact, the most important legal collections in use at this time prescribed death by means of burning for those who indulged in homosexual practices: "El pecado nefando es merecedor de mayores penas que por obra se pueden dar...establecemos y mandamos que cualquier persona de cualquier estado... que cometiere el delito nefando...que sea quemado en llamas de fuego" (Nueva recopilación, 1564). That this penalty really was put into action we may gather from the several references which Juan de Barrionuevo makes to the arrests and deaths of various homosexuals, in his reports on Madrilenian current affairs (Avisos, 1659, see, for example, sections CXVI and CLXVIII).

### The Courtly Fop

Neither was the homosexual the only kind of effeminate man to be severely criticized at this time. Many Spaniards seem to have regarded the ordinary courtly fop as, at best, an unpleasant phenomenon, even though his only offence lay in the wearing of make-up and elaborate clothes. Witness this extract from Juan de Zabaleta's incisive social survey:

El galán pide ropa limpia y dásela limpia y perfumada. La limpieza es precisa: los perfumes son excusados. Sin limpieza es un hombre aborrecible: con perfumes es notado. Limpio da a entender que cuida de sí: perfumado da a entender que idolatra en sí mismo...dánle el espejo...Agrádase de verse tan compuesto y dase la enhorabuena de lindo.  
(El día de fiesta por la mañana y por la tarde, 1659, ed. A.R.Chaves, pp. 14-15).

Less precisely written, but more damning, is Antonio Marqués's chapter on courtly guapos: "digo que entre los muchos abusos que España...ha resucitado de la gentilidad, uno es él de llevar los hombres copetes o rizos...én toda España no hay hombres sino mujeres" (Afeite y mundo mujeril, 1617, I, pp. 78-79).

Even more significant, perhaps, is the fact that in commenting on the proverb "Hombre palabrimujer, guárdeme Dios dél", Mal Lara implies that the effeminate man is a morally suspicious character:

Pues siendo la voz grave del varón,  
y la delicada de la hembra, hallar otra  
cosa es fuera de la orden de la  
naturaleza, y habémonos de guardar de  
hombre a quien oímos hablar como mujer,  
por alguna malicia secreta que hay  
en él.

(Filosofía vulgar, I, pp. 240-241).

The same foreboding tone characterizes Francisco Nuñez's calm acceptance and classical illustration of the age-old link between effeminacy and shame:

Escribe Hipócrates que entre los  
scitas se tenía por tanto denuesto  
y deshonra la esterilidad e impotencia  
de engendrar que tuviesen por  
averiguado haber ofendido a Dios en  
tanto grado, que luego mudasen de  
hábito femenino, publicándose por  
impotentes y afeminados, y se pasasen  
a la compañía de las mujeres, usando  
sus oficios.

(Dedication to El libro intitulado del  
parto humano, 1580, f. 2r).

From this evidence it is clear that while the effeminate man was for some seventeenth-century Spaniards little more than a symbol of vanity and worldly extravagance, he was for others a more sinister and morally suspect figure. However, surprisingly, in an age and country where "machismo" was highly prized, there seem to have been few satirical works in which the effeminate man was sharply mocked. R. Jammes picks out a handful of Góngora's Letrillas in which the prototype of the courtly fop comes in for some sharp pokes.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, there are indications of the possibility that in the fifteenth century the womanish courtier may have stood as an occasional figure of satire. One of El Provincial's scandalous coplas reads:



Juan de Ulloa y Valdivieso  
hombres cobardes y tristes,  
de la batalla que huisteis  
resulta ruin proceso.  
(Copla 69, ed. R. Foulché-Delbosc,  
Revue Hispanique, 4 (1898), p. 261).

However, as far as I can ascertain, this particular current of satire did not gain strength between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: Evidence  
of Greater Tolerance

On the few occasions when the effeminate man serves as a butt for some sixteenth or seventeenth-century joke, the humour seems to be of an exceptionally gentle variety - even when the comedian is the cutting Juan Rufo: "Hablaba un gentilhomme muy delgado y espaciamente, de manera que le llamaban todos un nombre de mujer. Era éste un hombre de bien, aunque mezquino, encogido y para poco..." (Las seiscientas apotegmas, 1596, no. 409). In this case the ending of the witticism is not particularly relevant. Nevertheless, the words underlined are important, because they suggest that the effeminate man may have been seen as a pathetic, rather than absurd, or totally reprehensible figure. Such also is the implication of one of Juan de Barrinuevo's observations on the extremely unmanly male: "Los capones ... no pierden ninguno las esperanzas de verse algún día hombre hecho y derecho" (Avisos, 1654, no. LXXII). These indications of a rather condescending sympathy are the nearest we have come so far to finding evidence of tolerant attitudes towards womanish men. However, Rufo's phrase "hombre de bien", as applied to an effeminate man, may not have sounded as strange to sixteenth-century ears as one is tempted to suppose.

Medical writer Jerónimo Cortés implies that the womanish man cuts a poor figure in general terms, but that he has one compensatory quality: intelligence: "Los de complexión fría... tienen el aliento y resuello pequeño y la voz delgada... tienen el color blanco o rosado, los cabellos largos y llanos, son temerosos

y para poco trabajo, pero suelen ser agudos de ingenio" (Fisonomía y varias secretas de la naturaleza, 1609, p. 102). This idea appears also in an emblem recently brought to light (for different purposes) by Duncan Moir.<sup>4</sup> Emblem 64 (f. 164<sup>r</sup>) of Covarrubias's collection shows the figure of a hermaphrodite, its unnatural qualities being described underneath with light irony, and subsequently related to the condition of the effeminate man. Interestingly, however, there is a shift of emphasis in Covarrubias's explanatory notes. While the emblem itself uses the hermaphrodite as a criticism of effeminacy, Covarrubias finishes by using the same symbol to defend it: "Suele nacer una criatura con ambos sexos... digo con Cicerón... non est turpius aut nequius efoeminato vir" (Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco, Emblemas morales, Madrid, 1610).

It must surely be more than mere coincidence that both Covarrubias and Cortés defend primarily the intelligence of the womanish man. After all, academic and artistic prowess were two of the few admirable qualities which contemporary historians noted in the effeminate Enrique IV: "Exercitábase en estudios de poesía y música, y para ello tenía ingenio bastante" (Juan de Mariana, Historia general de España, 1601, II, p. 417). Similarly, the weak, (although not particularly effeminate) man of the age, Fernando of Aragón, was obviously considered to make up in perspicacity what he lacked in brute force: "Ce n'est pas que /Ferdinand/ fût grand capitaine et que cette ambition lui vint d'un excès de courage; aussi vécut-il en un temps où l'esprit faisait plus que la vaillance" (Antoine de Brunel, Voyage en Espagne, 1664, p. 331). It therefore seems fair to conclude that the dislike and mockery frequently shown towards the womanish man was sometimes counterbalanced, in part, by a current of approval, and even of admiration, for his supposed intelligence. However, the strongest support for the argument that neither masculine women nor effeminate men can have been consistently regarded as unnatural and abhorrent at this time, comes from writers who openly show that they are fascinated by sexual irregularities of every kind.



The Attractions of Sexual Bizarrrity

That this fascination was quite a general reaction in the seventeenth century we can guess from the conflicting attitudes shown towards eunuchs. On the one hand, the anonymous and undated Diálogo del capón pours scorn on the castrati precisely because of their effeminate manners and characteristics: "Mal conoce Vuestra Paternidad al caponcito, no es género de gente ésta que sabe perdonar...! Qué verde está en su enojo, qué fresca tiene la injuria, qué en su punto la venganza... qué amenazas mujeriles!" (published Lucas de Torre, Revue Hispanique, 22 (1916), pp. 259-260). On the other, Covarrubias argues that the eunuch may well have more to him than meets the eye: "No embargante lo dicho nos consta haber habido en todos tiempos hombres capados valerosos y eminentes, así en armas como en letras, muy prudentes y grandes siervos de Dios" (Tesoro de la lengua castellana, 1611). More significantly, a letter written early in the seventeenth century by Francisco Cascales makes it plain that the eunuch's ambivalent sexuality sometimes gave his image an aura of mystery and angel-like purity:

Todas las veces que se los ofrece a los ángeles del cielo traer alguna embajada por parte de Dios... han tomado y toman no forma de mujer, no forma de varón barbado, no, sino de hombre capón... Dios dio a conocer el medio que hay entre la mujer y el hombre, que es el capón.

(Letter to Jerónimo Martínez de Castro, BAE, 62, p. 472b).

Medical Writers and Mythologists

This fascination with ambivalent and irregular sexuality is nowhere more apparent than in the works of specialists in medicine and mythology. Writers in both of these fields tend to jumble together "scientific fact" and tales from classical antiquity. In his chapter on genetics, for example, Juan Huarte recounts old Amazonian legends before proceeding to an exposition

of the theory that effeminate men and masculine women are products of sex changes which take place while the child is still in its mother's womb (El examen de ingenios, 1578, II, pp. 370-371). Similarly, mythologists like Baltasar de Vitoria and Juan Pérez de Moya do not hesitate to relate modern medical theories of this kind to various sexual metamorphoses recounted by Ovid. This fusing of the boundaries between ancient myth and scientific data inevitably meant that the whole topic of mixed or wavering sexuality was surrounded by an aura of mystery and semi-belief.

Even though Huarte's French critic, Jourdain Guibelet (Examen de l'Examen des Esprits, 1631, pp. 679-680) took evident pleasure in throwing cold water over all the Spaniard's theories about sex change and sexual similarities between men and women, it seems that within Spain itself the general attitude towards such topics was one of lively interest and, at least, half-acceptance. Certainly, Pérez de Moya is inclined to accord to Ovid's tale of Iphis an allegorical rather than literal interpretation:

Puédese aplicar esta fábula, diciendo  
que el volverse Iphis en hombre es  
cuando las mujeres están también  
criadas virtuosas y de buen entendimiento,  
que nos dan consejo de varones. O esto es  
pintar un alma que después de haberse  
dado un tiempo a los deleites, se vuelve  
a las virtudes varoniles.  
(Filosofía secreta, 1585, VI, 263<sup>v</sup>).

However, Baltasar de Vitoria, while accepting the philosophical implications, relates the story more concretely to the possibility of real-life sex changes: "Dicen los filósofos que la mujer no es otra cosa sino un varón imperfecto, y como la naturaleza siempre atiende a mejorarse y a perfeccionarse, de ahí viene que las mujeres vengan a convertirse en varones" (Del teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad, 1676, I, p. 493). Again, Antonio de Torquemada suggests, in his tentative way, that it is positively disrespectful to deny the possibility of nature producing sex changes, either before, or after, birth: "Pues no os



maravilléis tanto dello, que de lo que éste dice por cosa fingida y mentirosa, posible fue que fuese muy cierto en el mundo, conforme a otros que se cuentan y tienen, sin ninguna duda, por verdaderas" (El jardín de flores curiosas, 1569, ed. González de Amezúa y Mayo, p.78).

Unfortunately, it is impossible to measure exactly the degree of belief and acceptance with which Spaniards of the Golden Age approached mythological tales of hermaphrodites, warrior-maidens and sex changes. Equally, it is hard to assess how far they separated in their own minds the allegorical interpretations which they sometimes gave to these classical stories, from the theories of ambivalent sexuality which medical writers were putting forward as solid fact. Nevertheless, one aspect of their attitude towards all of these topics stands out very clearly from those accounts which I have read - they were delighted and intrigued by the idea of irregular or uncertain sexuality, rather than repulsed or shocked by it. See, for example, Padre de Vitoria's commentary on Ovid's tale of Hermaphroditus. Ovid himself presents the physical fusion of the nymph and the young boy as something of a tragedy: "They were no longer two, but a single form, possessed of a dual nature, which could not be called male or female, but seemed to be at once both and neither.../[the gods] infected the pool with this horrible magic power" (Metamorphoses, IV, trans. and ed. F.J. Miller, London, 1925, I, p.205). The dark undercurrents here are completely eliminated in Vitoria's version of the tale:

Es la naturaleza muy amiga de la variedad, y así con ella parece que se adorna y hermosea; y aunque al parecer de los ignorantes produce y cría algunas cosas imperfectas y monstruas, con esas se muestra ella más bella y más hermosa... Tal es el caso presente del hermafrodito, que es una persona, ni bien hombre, ni bien mujer, y es entrambas cosas, y esto fue un artificio grande de naturaleza para mostrarse varia, y admirablemente.

(Del teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad, II, p.60).

Perhaps this mythologist would have been willing to apply his theory of the "beautiful imperfections of nature" more specifically to the masculine woman and the effeminate man. It is difficult to tell, because he, like most of these writers on male/female ambivalence, is more interested in extreme and abstract concepts of sexual irregularity, than in more mundane problems like female dominance and foppish male behaviour. Nevertheless, if we are to take account of the orthodox Christian disapproval of homosexuality and female leadership, as part of the background to the "battle of the sexes", we should keep the picture in balance by noting the equally pervasive, pagan fascination with sexual irregularity of every kind. Since this was an age in which homosexuals could be burnt alive as "unnatural" creatures, but hermaphrodites held up as a delightful example of Nature's never-ending variety, it is not surprising that attitudes towards the masculine woman and the effeminate man were far more varied, inconsistent and conflicting than is often supposed.

The Reversal of Masculine and Feminine Roles:  
an Acceptable Solution

As final evidence for the argument that some Spaniards accepted the existence of strong women and weak men enough to cater for their most basic needs, I would quote the fact that they were sometimes recommended to settle down together as a pair. Of course, the masculine woman and the effeminate man do occasionally crop up together in comic contexts, as nothing more than a pair of incongruous opposites. Juan Rufo's apophthegm 132 furnishes a good example:

Cierto hidalgo natural de Castilla la Vieja, que si bien era virtuoso y apacible, tenía ademanes de mujer, y remedaba al vivo a todos los que trataba; tenía una hermana severa y varonil. Le dijo estos versos hablando en aquella extrañeza:

¡Válgame la soberana  
Virgen y madre de Dios!  
¡Qué mujer se pierde en vos!  
¡Y qué hombre en vuestra hermana!  
(Las seiscientas apotegmas, 1596).



However, as I argued previously, Spain had recently had ample opportunity to observe a perfectly successful example of a weak man/strong woman partnership in the joint government of the Catholic Monarchs. Moreover, the influential Juan Huarte suggests in all seriousness that for purposes of marriage and breeding the masculine woman and the effeminate man should make a good pair: "La mujer fría y húmeda en el primer grado...con voz abultada, de pocas carnes, verdinegra, bellosa y fea; ésta se empreñará fácilmente de un hombre necio, bien acondicionado, que tuviere la voz blanda y melosa, muchas carnes, blancas y blandas, con poco vello" (El examen de ingenios, 1578, II, p. 381). His suggestion is echoed a few years later, in a rather different context, by Juan de Mariana. This historian argues that the way to produce future kings of valor and ánimo is to mate the present - rather weak - princes, with specifically masculine noblewomen:

Así el ingenio ardiente de los príncipes muchas veces con la abundancia de los regalos se apaga en sus descendientes y desfallece, si los vicios no se corrigen con la buena enseñanza, y la sangre floja y muelle no se recuece y se reforma, y vuelve en su antiguo estado con darles por mujeres escogidas de alguna nación y linaje más robusto y varonil, con que en los hijos se repare la molicie y blandura de sus padres.  
(Historia general de España, 1601, II, p. 418).

Taking all this into account, then, it seems fair to suppose that the masculine woman and the effeminate man, as a pair, might well have represented a familiar, if unorthodox, social concept, for some of those who sat down to watch El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi. We do not even have to take it for granted that such a couple would have started out with a disadvantage insofar as audience sympathies were concerned. The evidence brought to bear would suggest that, while masculine women and effeminate men were frequently looked upon with disfavour, there were enough elements of tolerance, fascination, and even admiration, lurking behind their

image, for some degree of initial sympathy to be extended towards stage-figures who solved the "battle of the sexes" by accepting a relationship in which the traditional marital roles were inverted.

### Lope and the Masculine Woman

In point of fact, Lope's audiences must surely have been used to seeing on the stage all kinds of variations on the traditional marital partnership. It is self-evident that a many-sided exploration of the relationship between man and woman constitutes one of the axes of his theatre, and I think that this is the context in which the theme of inverted sexuality is best viewed. Since the appearance of Melveena M<sup>c</sup>Kendrick's study there is no longer any need to emphasize the point that Lope's female transvestites make up only one part of the broader strong woman topic. However, the persistence of the tendency to isolate the masculine heroine from the effeminate hero has resulted in the neglect of what seems to me the crux of the deviant sexuality question: the strong woman and the weak man as a joint metaphorical expression of the polyfaceted nature of sexual interaction.

Of course, there are a few strong woman plays which deal specifically with feminist notions in a general, social context. Many bandolera plays fall into this category, as do works like El valiente Céspedes and La varona castellana: "Nací con inclinación/a las armas y al ser varón" (La varona castellana, Ac. VIII, 222a). However, it seems that most of Lope's strong women are less interested in these extremist notions than they are in the fact that they are taking the active, dominant role in their marital relationships. Some of them, like the heroines of El galán escarmentado and Quien todo lo quiere are very obviously proud of their potential for ruling the domestic roost: "Si es soberbio, yo le haré/humilde con blandos ruegos" (Quien todo lo quiere, Ac. N. IX, 172a). Others regret the fact that the unmanliness of their lovers forces upon them



the traditionally masculine prerogative of directing the courtship:

Necio es el hombre que a solas  
así los efectos trueca  
que aguarda, siendo él galán  
a que la dama sea.  
(Más pueden celos que amor, Ac.N.XII, 552b).

Central to both attitudes, however, is a constant concern about the effects which such female supremacy will have on the relationship itself. Even the socially-conscious women rulers of Las flores de don Juan y rico y pobre trocados, El perro del hortelano and El rey por semejanza are ultimately less worried about the probability of their low-born husbands taking over in the sphere of social government, than they are about losing the upper hand in their personal man/woman relationships:

...creo  
que estás con menos deseo,  
pena el ser tu igual te da.  
Quiérasme tu criado,  
porque es costumbre de amor  
querer que sea inferior  
lo amado.  
(El perro del hortelano, ed. Kossoff, III.  
3168-3174).

It has already been pointed out that the physical battle between Laura and her lover in La vengadora de las mujeres could well be understood in the metaphorical terms of intersexual give-and-take<sup>5</sup>. The same kind of interpretation might be profitably applied to works like El favor agradecido, Las almenas de Toro and El soldado amante. Swash-buckling queens in all of these plays finally admit to themselves that they have lead their countries to war against patriarchal nations, not to prove the efficacy of feminine leadership in a general sense, but for the satisfaction of beating the rival male leader on a very personal level:

Pintad luego en mi bandera  
a un león rendido,  
y a la cordera famosa:

Rodiana, vitoriosa;  
 Dinacreonte vencido.  
 (El soldado amante, Ac.N.IX, 558b).

Even in Las mujeres sin hombres, the Amazonian transvestites involved in an initially social feminist rebellion, finally enact their battle with men on the metaphorical grounds of individual, intersexual relationships, rather than in the literal sphere of matriarchal rule:

Fineo        ¿Tú te defiendes de mí?  
 Hipólita    ¿Qué quieres que me defienda  
              si me rendí donde sabes?  
              (Ac.VI, 68b).

### Irregular Sexuality as a Background Topic

The argument that Lope's strong women are most often involved in a metaphorical enactment of the everyday "battle of the sexes" is not meant to rule out completely the possibility of their behaviour bringing to mind also aspects of the irregular sexuality topic which could be classified as subversive, or at least, extreme. In plays like El mesón de la corte and El ruiñeñor de Sevilla courtships between strong women and weak men are played out against a background of light-hearted joking on the subject of vacillating sexuality. Nothing emerges more clearly from this banter than that delight in sexual ambivalence per se which we noted earlier in some theoretical writers:

Alberto    ¡Hola capón! ¿Sabes tú  
              dónde le hallaré tan gordo  
              para cenar? ¿Estás sordo?  
 Pedro      ¿En casa de Bercebú?  
              ¿No tiene el hombre otro nombre?  
              Perdona, señor... barbado.  
              (El mesón de la corte, Ac.N.I, 286b).

In a rather more forboding way, many of the plays in which women are made to fall in love with female transvestites touch on the subversive extremes of the sexuality topic. Take, for example, El anzuelo de Fenisa, Más pueden celos que amor and Los bandos de Sena. In all of these works



the dramatic device by which one woman unwittingly falls for another gives rise to the highly disturbing notion that women actually prefer effeminate men:

Esto de ser desbarbado  
es apetecible cosa.  
El pie firme  
y la pierna airosa,  
y esto de pluma y soldado  
no sé que tiene atractivo.  
(Los bandos de Sena, Ac.N.III, 55a).

Again, in Amar por burla, La resistencia honrada and Quien más no puede the central "battle of the sexes" theme is given an additional dimension by the implication that feminine leadership in the courtship game is symptomatic of a world shaken out of its natural order: "adonde ya los hombres son mujeres/nos volveremos las mujeres hombres" (Quien más no puede, Ac.N.IX, 148b).

Clearly, on the seventeenth-century stage, as in seventeenth-century life, the everyday problem of intersexual conflict was connected with both the concept of feminist rebellion and the exotic topic of ambivalent sexuality. Nevertheless, I would argue that these sensational aspects of the subject were far less central to Lope's theatre than the more concretely life-related notion of the intersexual power game. After all, Lope did not hesitate himself to put a markedly down-to-earth interpretation on the concept of the Amazon: "Y aun he oído decir que andan algunas amazonas entre nosotros, como son viudas mal acondicionadas, suegras terribles y doncellas incasables, que todas éstas infaliblemente son amazonas, o vienen de ellas" (prologue to Las mujeres sin hombres, Ac.N.IX, 148b). If the dramatist related the idea of the masculine woman to the figure of the difficult mother-in-law rather than to some extremist individual like, for example, La monja Alférez, then we are surely justified in supposing that a large number of his strong woman plays may also revolve more around everyday man/woman problems than around sensational aspects of the feminist and sexual irregularity questions. However, before moving on to the ways in which Lope's Amazons solve the problems

of intersexual relationship, it is necessary to examine some of the weak men who stand as their counterparts.

### Lope and the Courtly Fop

Lope seems to have been the first to develop the figure of the weak man as a regular feature of the Spanish stage. It is true that early plays like Medora, Eufemia (Lope de Rueda, pub. 1567) and La comedia Serafina (Torres de Naharro, pub. 1533) bring on to the stage heroes whose helplessness and naïveté anticipate the pathetic male protagonists of Lope plays like Amar por burla and El mármol de Felisardo. However, these pioneer dramatists tended to use their weak heroes mainly as foils for the vitality of the female protagonists, leaving to Lope himself the task of exploring in depth the problems and possibilities offered by the concept of effeminacy.

On the other hand, some of the dramatists writing after Lope de Vega seem to have adopted the weak man as a stock figure. Ruth Lee Kennedy has already suggested that Moreto in particular specialized in the production of heroes who were less than masculine, and Frank P. Casa has partially supported her argument by maintaining that El lindo don Diego (1652) develops more carefully than any previous Spanish play the figure of the conceited fop.<sup>6</sup> In point of fact, the courtly weakling figures prominently in a large number of seventeenth-century Spanish plays, including Rojas's Entre bobos anda el juego (1645), Solís y Rivadeynera's El amor al uso (1652), and Villaviciosa's Cuántas veo tantas quiero (1653). His presence is nearly always associated with the theme which appears to have absorbed dramatists all over Europe during this period: the romantic versus the cynical, or materialistic, concept of marriage. In Spain, at least, the reformation of the fop was consistently used to teach that true love can make a responsible man out of the most spineless milksop:

Es fuerza que me declare  
o lo pierda todo, quiero  
que tú, Isabel, me perdones,  
y tú, Clara, mis afectos



admitas; porque desde hoy  
eres mi absoluto dueño.  
(El amor al uso, BAE.XLVII, 21b).

The prevalence of this notion in the theatre of the late seventeenth century appears to have meant that the weak man became increasingly popular as a stage-figure, but that he was ultimately developed in one direction only - that of the exaggeratedly smooth-talking fop.

Of course, the desire to disassociate "true love" from the affected love-language traditionally expected from the effeminate cavalier was by no means a novelty in the second half of the seventeenth century. Lope had already developed one or two of his weak men around the notion that high-flown love-language bespoke both unmanliness and emotional immaturity. In El sembrar en buena tierra, for example, a boyish new noble almost loses the woman he loves because she sees his attempts at exaggerated galanteo as indicative of a false heart. Similarly, in La discreta enamorada the first exchange between Gerarda and Lucindo would probably have told the audience quite a lot about the emotionally unequal weighting of their relationship, as well as about Lucindo's tendency towards conceited effeminacy:

Gerarda ¿Que soy tu querida prenda?  
Lucindo Así es razón que te nombres.  
Gerarda Galán de palabras vienes.  
Lucindo Ando al uso...  
Gerarda Luego, ¿préciaste de lindo?  
Lucindo ¿De lindo? Donaire tienes.  
Préciome de hombre.  
(Ac.XIV, 396a-396b).

There are, then, indications that Lope and his age did sometimes tend, like the later seventeenth century, to associate the figure of the weak man specifically with notions of courtly exaggeration and foppish insincerity. I would argue, however, that just as Lope dealt with the unmanly male more fully and seriously than those of his dramatic predecessors known to me, he developed this figure in a far less limited and stereo-typed way than did later Spanish dramatists.

The Male Transvestite

To begin with the most obvious kind of effeminate stage-figure, it is clear that Lope's male transvestites are much fewer and much less significant, metaphorically, than his female transvestites. In plays like El mesón de la corte, El paraíso de Laura y florestas de amor and La discreta enamorada there is every reason to suppose that the scenes in which men have occasion to dress up as women would have been presented as pure farce. Witness the hilarious lesson in female mimicry which is given by one witty gracioso to another:

Pues con voz algo imperfecta  
te podrás bien defender.  
Pide treguas a su intento  
con un tipillo adamado,  
y tú quedarás premiado  
del Conde, según lo siento.  
(El paraíso de Laura y florestas de amor,  
Ac.N.VIII, 388b).

As Melveena M<sup>c</sup>Kendrick has pointed out, the greater awareness of homosexuality than of lesbianism during this period undoubtedly made it difficult for dramatists to accord to the extreme effeminate the same thoughtful treatment that they could give to the overtly masculine woman. Certainly, La boda entre dos maridos pokes cruel fun at an "unnaturally" close friendship between two men:

Fabia quiero, es verdad,  
pero más te quiero a ti,  
que hallar podré por ahí  
mujeres en cantidad;  
que tú sólo estás en mí,  
y estás en mí de tal suerte  
que mujer, mudanza y muerte  
no me apartarán de ti.  
(Ac.XIV, 580b).

However, once the extremes of the effeminate man topic are effectively barred, it becomes evident that there is a wide variety of seriously portrayed weak men in Lope's theatre.



### Male Weakness and Anti-Heroic Trends

Some of these unmanly protagonists - like the galanes of Justas de Tebas and Quien más no puede - are merely inconstant, ineffective or indecisive in affairs of the heart. Others, like the heroes of La infanta desesperada and La resistencia honrada, are downright passive and cowardly, and a few are portrayed as naïve youths who fail in their handling of tricky situations because they have yet to master the finer points of machería:

Como mozo inadvertido...  
entre otros tales,  
con travesuras iguales  
en Salamanca he vivido.  
Mas no porque tu afición  
que tan de veras me enciende...  
pudiese helar mi abrazado corazón.  
(La serrana de Tormes, Ac.N.IX, 471a).

From this handful of examples it will be clear that Lope's extensive dealings with the figure of the weak man - in all his various guises - makes it necessary for us to talk in terms of "anti-heroes". There were, in fact, several currents of thought, both literary and social, which may well have helped to turn artistic focuses away from the traditionally heroic macho and towards the infinitely less admirable marica at the time when Lope was writing.

Firstly, the alabanza de aldea, menosprecio de corte theme which sometimes lays behind the dramatic juxtaposition of peasant integrity and aristocratic degeneracy, undoubtedly played a part in producing some of the vain and/or inept courtiers of the seventeenth-century stage (see, for example, La quinta de Florencia and El mejor alcalde el Rey). Secondly, the anti-heroic trends of the picaresque novel would suggest a growing interest in the potential of the non-admirable protagonist. Thirdly, and most importantly, the impact of the gracianesque concept of the hero was such that traditional ideals of machería were increasingly brought into conflict with a new admiration for prudence and quiet cunning.

It is well known that tragic plays like El Hamete de Toledo and Los comendadores de Córdoba rely heavily on a pathetic development of the notion that the fierce man of honour is the one most likely to confuse bravery with bravado. More to my point here is the failure of dashing young heroes in works like El galán escarmentado and El silencio agradecido to reach the full stature of manhood until they have learnt that cunning is just as necessary as courage:

Tomar pudiera venganza  
de tu crueldad por los filos,  
mas soy Guevara y Beamonte...  
(El silencio agradecido, Ac.N, IX, 550b).

However, if the traditional ideals of "machismo" came under fire in some of those plays which emphasize prudence, self-control and cunning as vital qualities in el hombre de bien, there are other plays in which the opposite case is argued. The protagonists of many comedias, including La burgalesa de Lerma, Amor secreto hasta celos and El lacayo fingido only make good their escape from effeminacy once they have exchanged cunning for a first assertion of masculine pride, and Más pueden celos que amor is very clear indeed in its condemnation of the man who brings about an inversion of the sexual roles by preferring gracianesque caution to daring initiative:

¿Qué había de hacer Otavia  
después de ponerte un tiro  
la caza?...  
Y tú, como labrador  
para la boda vestido,  
aguardando que te diese  
la desposada un pellizco.  
(Ac.N.XII, 562a).

Obviously, Lope's development of the weak man, like his portrayals of the strong woman, is life-related in very basic senses. It raises the questions of how far bravery can go before becoming bravado, of when it is necessary for a man to let dignified self-restraint give way to boldness, of whether some characteristics (like cunning) are predominantly feminine and others (like



masterfulness) indispensably masculine: of what, in fact, constitutes the essence of masculinity. With this kind of depth behind his explorations of the unmanly male, it is not surprising that even when Lope's weak heroes do not finally arrive at an understanding of the concept of manliness, they are still not portrayed with the unmitigated contempt which many dramatists after Lope accorded to their "unreformed fops".

The Compensatory Attributes of Lope's  
Weak Men

I have already suggested that some seventeenth-century Spaniards regarded intelligence as a common indemnificatory factor in the make-up of the effeminate man. I would now argue that many of Lope's weak heroes are redeemed to some extent by traits of thoughtfulness, critical self-awareness and sensitivity. We are obviously expected to disapprove the cowardly vacillation of Roberto in La inocente Laura and the spineless passivity of Lupercio in Los embustes de Celauro:

¿Hay hombre que quiera más  
ni que se parezca menos?  
Dime, cifra de venenos,  
¿dónde huyes? ¿Dónde vas?  
Pero vete donde quieras,  
cazador acorbado.  
(Los embustes de Celauro, Ac.N.XII, 129b).

However, in both plays - and in others, like La infanta desesperada and La esclava de su galán - the weakling's awareness of his own ineptitude inevitably stimulates pity for the dilemma of the man whose society demands more bold decisiveness than he is fitted by nature to give:

Por Dios, Galo, que le mates,  
que no tengo corazón...  
Conozco que culpa ha sido  
y atrevimiento insolente;  
mas debes imaginar  
que le dieron ocasión,  
y es hombre.  
(La inocente Laura, Ac.N.XII, 372a).

Similarly, in tragic works like La fuerza lastimosa and our own El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi a fatally effeminate streak seems to go hand-in-hand, in the male protagonists, with an outstanding capacity for devoted affection: "que soy padre, y con amor, / puedo decir disparates" (El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi, II.209-210). The tenderness of these weak men does not, of course, excuse their cowardice. It does, however, like the self-questioning of other of Lope's unmanly heroes, disassociate them from the prototype of the caricatured fop, by making them eminently human.

The Attraction of Opposites:  
the Fop and the Amazon as a Pair

Perhaps the clearest indication of Lope's serious and tolerant attitude towards his weak heroes lies in the variety of solutions which he appears to propose to the problem of the weak man/strong woman relationship. Several of his plays suggest an "attraction of the opposites" principle in operation between effeminate men and masculine women. Los novios de Hornachuelos, Justas de Tebas and El honrado hermano bring to mind Juan Huarte's advice on the pairing off of the fop and the Amazon, because they emphasize an immediate and powerful affinity between extremely robust women and men who are physically frail. The more complex Pedro de Urdemalas highlights the platonic elements in the love between a tough villana and a courtly weakling. Here, the implication must surely be that this kind of union has to be catered for in a social sense, if only because the lovers in question form the two halves of a "platonic orange", destined for one another in a natural sense:

Me senté, dormí y soñé,  
sueños que serán verdades  
si en los accidentes nuestros  
son las estrellas iguales.  
(Ac.N.VIII, 399a).



Solutions to the Intersexual Power Game:  
the Return to the Norm

Melveena M<sup>C</sup>Kendrick has argued that Lope's answer to all the feminist problems raised by his plays revolves around a return to the norm. Applying this contention to the metaphorical interpretation put forward here, I would judge that many, although by no means all, of his man/woman plays do suggest that love encourages a "natural" reversion of "unnaturally" inverted sexual roles. Works like La burgalesa de Lerma, Los milagros del desprecio, El perro del hortelano and La viuda valenciana finally illustrate the notion that a woman in love naturally develops a desire for the weaker role in the relationship, thus bringing out in her partner a new willingness to take on the stronger, protective role:

Juana ¡Señor don Pedro Girón,  
amparadme!  
Pedro Sí, haré.  
Caballeros, acudir  
a las mujeres es justo.  
(Los milagros del desprecio,  
Ac.N.XIII, 25a).

In fact, the idea that man and woman interact upon each other to produce the conventional situation in which masculine masterfulness is kept in check by feminine cunning is so common in Lope's theatre that the lovers of La dama boba are even able to parody it with tongue-in-cheek irony:

Laurencio Detened la espada, Otavio;  
yo soy, que estoy con mi esposa...  
Finea Pues, padre, ¿de qué se enoja?...  
Ya sabe que soy medrosa.  
(Ac.N.XI, 633a).

There is, indeed, reason to suppose that Lope himself may have believed quite strongly in the natural ability of men and women to coax each other into the interacting roles traditionally allotted to them. In the invaluable prologue to Las mujeres sin hombres he writes: "Claro estaba que el valor de mujeres determinadas sólo con

la blandura del amor podía ser vencido" (Ac.VI,35). His apparent faith in the power of love to bring out woman's natural softness is complemented by his assertion elsewhere that a real appeal for masculine courage and leadership will make a man out of the most unpromisingly effeminate lad: "ha llegado...la insolencia a usar los hombres moldes, rizos, aguas, aceites, labores para el cabello...mas dicen que sobre aquellos afeites caen, cuando es necesario, las armas como antes duras" (letter to Bartolomé Jiménez Patón, 1627, ed. González de Amezúa y Mayo, IV, 99-100).

Within the bounds of my own reading, the play which explores most deeply this notion of the traditional, interlocking roles of man and woman is, in effect, Las mujeres sin hombres. Here, a camp of Amazons and a group of gentle courtiers confuse themselves and each other by running through a whole range of contradictory attitudes. For both men and women the mating game involves violent oscillations between ~~aggressive~~ "masculinity" and helpless "femininity":

Nuestros blasones y famas  
resistencias y ademanes,  
paró en que somos galanes  
y los hombres nuestras damas.  
(Ac.VI, 54a).

The dominant implication that both sexes are capable of behaving, at different times, with feminine vulnerability and masculine toughness may sound rather unorthodox. However, we might take account again here of the emphasis which some medical writers were placing on the similarities between men and women: "Dicen que la mujer no es otra cosa que un varón imperfecto. Y así leemos que las hembras se mudan en varones" (Blas Álvarez Miraval, La conservación de la salud del cuerpo y del alma, 1593, f.286<sup>r</sup>). Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to imagine that a seventeenth-century audience would have accepted the concept of "emotional bisexuality" - alongside that of the different interlocking roles of man and woman - as a perfectly legitimate part of the sexual interaction topic.



Less Orthodox Solutions:  
the Emphasis on Sexual Equality

As the last section suggests, there are some man/woman plays in which Lope stresses not the natural reversion of the marital roles to their traditional form, but the absolute and fundamental equality of man and woman. In works like !Si no vieran las mujeres!, Amor secreto hasta celos and La hermosa fea men and women struggle to gain the upper hand in the direction of the courtship. The way in which they overcome each other at different points suggests that the battle of the sexes is one in which neither party starts with an unfair advantage over the other. As the King of !Si no vieran las mujeres! comments in one of his more lucid moments: "Que en amor ha sido/ siempre el vencedor, el más vencido". The same point is made more explicitly in Querer la propia desdicha, where the balance of emotional power swings between Juan and Ángela precariously enough to imply that the fundamental equality of man and woman lies in the ever-shifting inequality between them. Again, El rey por semejanza furnishes an illustration of the notion that love forces men and women to "bow down" to each other: "Vime, cual digo, tu igual, /y arrojéme a idolatrarte" (Ac. N. II, 508b). Of course, this idea of a basic parity between the sexes is particularly frequent in, and relevant to, those of Lope's plays which deal with the socially unequal marriage.

Personal and Social Inequality

I have explored elsewhere the seventeenth-century belief that the need for male dominance in a marital relationship made it particularly undesirable for a woman to marry beneath herself. It is therefore clear that Lope's emphasis on personal equality between socially unequal partners is highly significant. In some of his upstart plays, like El rey por semejanza and El favor agradecido, final events indicate that the world will accept the plebeian hero as social leader and masterful husband because he has taken over his wife's status under cover of a public lie about his birth. In these

cases, however, we are given reason to believe that, in private, the marital basis of absolute truth will clear the path for complete personal equality between man and woman:

Reina        Advertid que sois mi esposo.  
 Altemio     Yo soy él que gano en ello  
               tanta merced; mirad bien,  
               señora, que soy Altemio.  
 Reina        Muy bien sé que Altemio sois  
               pero a Altemio es a quien quiero.  
 Altemio     Dadme esos pies a besar.  
               (El rey por semejanza, Ac.N.II, 524b).

In other works, like Arminda celosa and Las flores de don Juan y pobre y rico trocados, upstarts who do not attempt to hide their identity tolerate the necessity of accepting in public the greater authority of their wives, while demonstrating in private that they are, henceforth, the leaders of the marital relationship:

Antonio     A Arminda pareces  
               que fue mi primero amor.  
               ¿Eres tú, señora mía?  
 Arminda     Yo soy, que pagar querría  
               llorando tanta crueldad.  
               (Arminda celosa, Ac.N.I, 709a).

It would seem, in fact, that some of Lope's less orthodox solutions to the "battle of the sexes" spring from the contemporary idea (noted earlier) that the balance of power could move freely between man and wife, so long as an outward appearance of male domination was maintained. The difference is, of course, that Lope, unlike the marriage theorists, stresses the private truthfulness between man and woman as the main point of the deception, the public lie itself being but an end to, or cover for, the natural, equally-matched and highly personal "coming to grips" of man and wife.

#### The Question of Moral Culpability

As the previous section implies, I find the idea of blame, as applied on a grand scale, rather irrelevant to the irregular sexuality topic. Certainly, in those



plays - like Pedro de Urdemalas and Nardo Antonio, bandolero - which tackle more literally the notion of feminist revolt, there is a degree of serious criticism levelled at female militants. It is far more usual, however, for both tough women and weak men to be presented by Lope as novices in the game of love. Therefore, the concept of moral culpability is rarely applicable to the kind of lessons which they learn during the mutual adjustment processes of courtship. Take, for example, Amor secreto hasta celos, La hermosa fea and !Si no vieran las mujeres!. In these works men and women struggle shamelessly to deflate each other's arrogance, and indications of feminine modesty and masculine gallantry are notably lacking. Yet, there is such a sense of delight in the "battle of the sexes" per se, that all notions of solemn judgement on the "unnatural" behaviour of the lovers become irrelevant:

Pareces amante halcón  
 en conquistar su belleza,  
 que gustando de que la caza  
 que ha de comer se defienda.  
 (La hermosa fea, Ac.N.XII, 258b).

I have already argued that some Lope plays imply a qualified criticism of the markedly unmanly male. The same works often praise the unladylike heroine whose determination ensures the continuation of the courtship:

¿Tal invención  
 una dama pudo hacer  
 de vuestro heróico valor?  
 (Más pueden celos que amor,  
 Ac.N.XII, 579b).

However, it is again a reflection of Lope's complex perspective on the man/woman topic that he occasionally portrays with optimism the match between the irredeemably weak man and the determinedly dominant woman.

In works like Quien más no puede, Justas de Tebas and Más pueden celos que amor we are given no reason to suppose that the female domination so pronounced during the courtship period will weaken at all in the future,

but every reason to suppose that these marriages will nevertheless be happy and socially acceptable. Similarly, the reuniting of the cowardly Lupericio and his strong-minded wife at the end of Los embustes de Celauro obviously heralds a rosy future. In this play, however, it is no part of Lope's purpose to suggest that marital contentment will bring out in the hero that firmness traditionally demanded of the good family man:

Éstos ya no son  
tus hijos...  
¿son míos  
porque no aprendan tus bríos.  
(Ac.N.XII, 134b).

A compromise with the standard rules of the mating game may, we gather, produce a satisfactory partnership.

The Conclusions and Their Application to  
El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi

My final summing-up, then, rests upon the contention that the majority of Lope's masculine women and effeminate men are to be seen neither as unreal figures in a world of fun and fantasy, nor as representatives of extreme notions of social feminism and sexual irregularity. There was a real-life awareness of the "battle of the sexes" as an everyday problem at the time when Lope was writing, and there were some Spaniards who supported the idea that it could be solved in ways which contradicted the traditional male dominance/female submission ruling. Correspondingly, many of Lope's weak man/strong woman plays lend themselves to interpretation in the semi-metaphorical terms of sexual interaction and marital power-games. To suggest that our dramatist wrote with a real understanding of the dilemmas facing the masculine woman and the effeminate man, and that both traditional and less orthodox solutions to the emotional warfare of the sexes played a part in his theatre, is merely to acknowledge once again that he was an artist sensitive to the cross-currents of his age.



. In point of fact, El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi is highly illustrative of the conflict most central to the real-life sexual interaction topic. The constant regret of the heroine when faced with her husband's refusal to take the lead in their relationship is undoubtedly an expression of the traditional belief that male dominance is best in marriage. The belief itself is reinforced by the fact that Antonio's cowardice at the crucial moment contributes to the tragic causes. However, Lope stresses that, on home ground, the marriage is blissfully happy. This is, in effect, one of those plays in which he is concerned with the possibilities of a compromise with convention, and his conclusion would seem to be that an outright defiance of the traditional norms of sexual interaction can indeed constitute one of the many ways in which man and woman "click together".

.

Footnotes to Chapter VII

1. Julia Fitzmaurice Kelly, "Woman in Sixteenth-Century Spain", Revue Hispanique, LXX (1927), 557-634; María del Pilar Oñate, El feminismo en la literatura española (Madrid, 1938); M. Romera-Navarro, "Las disfrazadas de varón en la comedia", Hispanic Review, II (1934), 269-286; Barbara Matulka, "The Feminist Theme", Romanic Review, XXVI (1935), 191-231; R. O. Jones, "El perro del hortelano y la visión de Lope", Filología, X (1964), 135-142; Simon A. Vosters, "Lope de Vega y las damas doctas", in Actas del tercer congreso internacional de hispanistas, ed. Carlos H. Magis (Mexico, 1970), 909-921; Melveena M<sup>c</sup>Kendrick, Woman and Society in the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age. A Study of the Mujer Varonil (Cambridge, 1974).
  
2. See Gregorio Marañón, Ensayo sobre Enrique IV de Castilla y su tiempo (Madrid, 1930).
  
3. See R. Jammes, Études sur l'Oeuvre Poétique de Don Luis de Góngora y Argote (Bordeaux, 1967).
  
4. See Duncan Moir, "Lope de Vega's Fuenteovejuna and the Emblemas morales of Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco (with a Few Remarks on El villano en su rincón)", in Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez, Madrid, 1971, 537-546.
  
5. See J. W. Sage, "The Context of Comedy. Lope de Vega's El perro del hortelano and Related Plays", in Studies in Spanish Literature of the Golden Age Presented to Edward M. Wilson, ed. R. O. Jones (London, 1973), 247-266.
  
6. Ruth Lee Kennedy, The Dramatic Art of Moreto (Cambridge, 1966); Frank P. Casa, The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Moreto (Cambridge, 1966).



The Date of El mayordomo de la  
Duquesa de Amalfi

Lope acknowledged his authorship of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi by including it in the second Peregrino list. On the basis of metrical calculations Morley and Bruerton have estimated that he wrote it sometime between 1599 and 1606, probably within the last two years of this period. Certainly it was destined for performance in Toledo in 1606, for its presentation is mentioned as part of a business deal between Andrés de Alcocer and Alonso de Riquelme in the May of that year. The wording of the agreement - which states that two of the other plays involved were to be works which had been performed before - would suggest that this was to be the first staging of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi :

Son por todas cuatro comedias, que han de ser La infanta Leonida y El mayordomo, y las otras dos de las que se hicieron en Oropesa por los susodichos, de las que hicieron en Talavera o las les señalaron en Talavera, que sean de las que hayan hecho allí.

Documento 212, 22 de mayo, 1606, in Lope de Vega, los cómicos toledanos y el poeta sastre, ed. Francisco de San Román (Madrid, 1934).

It would seem, therefore, that there is adequate reason for an acceptance of the suggested 1604-1606 dating.

A Sequel Play

We do not know how El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi was received by seventeenth-century audiences. That it did not, however, fall into immediate obscurity is suggested by the fact that it inspired a - rather unimpressive - sequel play. Diego Muxet de Solís's Comedia de la venganza de la Duquesa de Amalfi was published in Brussels in 1624, forming part of a collection entitled Comedias humanas y divinas. There can be no doubt that it was Lope's play which furnished the starting point for this optimistic resolution of the Amalfi drama.

Julio, Otavio, Urbino and the rustic foster-parents all make their appearance in Solís's work, and the moral lesson emphasized throughout is that blood feuds should be nipped in the bud by an application of Christian forgiveness. The addition of a fourth Amalfi child (supposedly born in the Duchess's death throes), and the weaving in of an amorous intrigue allowed Solís to lay the foundations of a peaceful conclusion to the eternal chain of vengeance at which Lope had hinted in the denouement of his play. In this, I think he mis-represented the intentions of his predecessor. Much of the impact - both social and tragic - of Lope's finale lies in Amalfi's vow of vengeance and its implications of catastrophic repetition. Nevertheless, this later work does provide some interesting pointers as to the interpretation which a seventeenth-century Spaniard might have put on El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi.

It is quite clear that Solís sees Lope's Julio as a thorough villain, his Otavio as a dangerous madman, his rustics as exemplary Christians, and his Duchess as an innocent victim. He tends to pass over, in the tragic flashbacks, the part played by Antonio, and is not altogether sympathetic to the honourable indignation of the young Amalfi. Nevertheless, his insistence on the courage and virtue of Cesarino - the fictitious fourth child - implies strong support for the mésalliance which produced him. If the sequel work stresses the immorality of an eternal chain of vengeance, rather than the pathetic situation of the tragic survivor (which is where the emphasis falls in Lope's last scene), it does at least show that the earlier dramatist had made his point about social barriers to true love as a deplorable tragic cause.



The Texts of El mayordomo de la Duquesa  
de Amalfi

We have no seventeenth-century manuscript copy of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi and, in preparing this edition, I have consulted the five copies of the text which are listed below with their shorthand symbols:

- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| The text of <u>Parte XI</u> (Madrid, 1618;<br>Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, R14104):                     | A                   |
| The text of <u>Parte XI</u> (Barcelona, 1618;<br>British Library, London, 11726.K.17):                  | B                   |
| An eighteenth-century manuscript copy<br>(Biblioteca Palatina, Parma, CC*.IV.28033):                    | C                   |
| The <u>Academia</u> edition (produced by<br>Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, vol. XV,<br>Madrid, 1913):     | D                   |
| The composite London text of <u>Parte XI</u><br>(Madrid, 1618; British Library, London,<br>11726.K.16): | The primary<br>text |

As can be seen from this list, Parte XI appeared in two versions, one published in Madrid, and the other in Barcelona, both in the year 1618. Both copies contain a dedication, a prologue and an aprobación by Gutierre de Cetina. The Barcelona version (B) also has a second aprobación written by Fr. Onofre de Requesens, but lacks the fe de erratas featured by the Madrid copy (A). In fact, the absence of this fe de erratas in B has been quoted by A. David Kossoff as support for the argument that A was the earlier text, and B a copy of it.<sup>1</sup> The chronological precedence of A is also suggested by the fact that the first aprobación, written by Cetina and common to both versions, bears the date 4<sup>th</sup> February 1618, while the second aprobación, which does not figure in A, was written seven months later, on 8<sup>th</sup> September 1618. A has 295 folios while B has 292, and the layout of both title pages is reproduced below:

A

ONZENA/PARTE DE/LAS COMEDIAS DE/LOPE DE  
VEGA CARPIO,FA-/MILIAR DEL SANTO OFICIO./  
DIRIGIDAS A DON BERNABE/de Vivanco y  
Velaſco,Cavallero del Abito de San/tiago,  
de la Camara de ſu Magestad./Sacadas de  
ſus originales./Año 1618/CON PRIVILEGIO/  
En Madrid,por la viuda de Alonſo Martin  
de Balboa./A coſta de Alonſo Perez  
mercader de libros./Vendense en la calle  
de Santiago.

B

DOZE/COMEDIAS/DE LOPE DE VEGA/CARPIO,  
FAMILIAR DEL SANTO/oficio:sacadas de sus  
originales./DIRIGIDAS A DON BERNABE/de  
Vivanco y Velaſco,Cavallero del Abito de  
San/tiago,de la camara de ſu Magestad./  
Onzena Parte/Año 1618/CON LICENCIA/  
En Barcelona,por Sebaſtian de Cormellas,  
y a ſu Coſta.

That there was,indeed,a relationship between these two copies,is suggested by the fact that their versions of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi contain five identical errors:

- i) de lo que penséis me pesa (I.78)
- ii) cual hombre que duerme,  
esta quimera ha compuesto (II.265-266)
- iii) pobra y sola (III.278)
- iv) una camisa de anejo (III.308)
- v) con cuanto heredo a mi padre...  
le doy todos los demás (III.817-822)

B also contains some twenty slips which do not occur in A.As can be seen from the following examples,they look like errors of copying:



A

Como le abrasó

(I.286)

¿Qué más que andar amurado?

(I.1040)

quien primero le destruya

(II.1082)

¿De esa respuesta tenías  
alguna duda?

(I.459-460)

Muchos desearon ver

a los celos...

digo que este niño vea

quien verlos vivos desea.

(II.303-317)

que venga picado el gusto

(II.521)

Digo que sea por vos.

(III.859)

que basta que una mujer

(I.381)

...que después

de hablarle,...

(II.329-330)

¿Qué mochila le pondrán?

(II.909)

B

Como le a abrasó

¿Qué más que andar a murado?

quien primero lo destruya

¿De esa respuesta temas  
alguna duda?

Muchos desearon ver

a los celos...

digo que este niño vea

quien ver los niños desea.

que venga picado es gusto

Digo que sepa por vos.

que hasta que una mujer

...que después  
de hablarme,...

¿Qué muchilla le pondrán?

Errors of the same kind are to be found on the following occasions in B:I.499;I.543;I.796;I.921;I.1106;I.1147;II.633;II.775;II.968;II.997;III.951;III.985.

In addition, there are fifteen occasions when B differs from A and when either of the variant readings would be acceptable, for example:

A

El cura que han llamado  
(I.1123)

Con su pecho tan sincero  
(II.441)

Si ella os oyera  
(I.991)

...A mí más me espanta  
que esa alabanza me des.  
(I.246-247)

Sale Libia con un niño  
en los brazos.  
(II.250)

B

El cura que ha llamado

Con un pecho tan sincero

Si ella lo oyera

A mí más me espanta  
que esa alabanza le des.

Sale Libia con una niña  
en los brazos.

Other of these equally valid variant readings are to be found as follows: I.576; I.1108; I.1113; I.1147; II.284; II.251; II.422; II.568; III.720.

More importantly, there are three occasions on which B gives a reading which is definitely superior to that offered by A:

A

Cuando han subido la sobra  
(I.1101)  
que a ser pecados los años,  
aunque se ve en la cara  
(I.1017-1019)  
Ayude el Duque a su madre  
y a España se pueden ir.  
(III.814-815)

B

Cuando han sabido la sobra  
que a ser pecados los años,  
aunque se ven en la cara  
Ayude el Duque a su madre  
y a España se puede ir.

On the whole, then, B contains more errors than A. The fact that more than half of its variant readings appear to represent mis-readings on the part of the printer, plus the fact that it contains an additional, later aprobación, would suggest that it was probably a copy of the Madrid text, which corrupted on more occasions than it corrected.



The London copy of Parte XI (our primary text) is a composite copy made up from A and B. It bears the title page of the Madrid version, and a preliminary hand-written note, which reads as follows:

En este exemplar, ademas de la portada y preliminares, falta la 1<sup>a</sup> pieza, en cuyo lugar se ha sustituido una impresión suelta de la misma.

Las cinco, desde la 8<sup>a</sup> (La locura por la honra) hasta la 12<sup>ma</sup> inclusivas, son de la edición de Barcelona, por Sebastián Cormellas del año de 1618.

According to the catalogue this note was written by J.R. Chorley. Various imperfections in the plays themselves, including the last folio of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi, have been supplied by hand, and since our play comes ninth in the list of contents, one is immediately tempted to assume that it was drawn from the Barcelona text (B) referred to by Chorley. Indeed, the London copy does include the three superior readings given by B (I.1101; I.1017-1020; III.814-815), and three of its inferior offerings:

<u>A</u>	<u>B and the London Copy</u>
¿Dos meses <u>dices</u> que ha estado en la cama? (II.36-37)	¿Dos meses <u>dice</u> que ha estado en la cama?
Si con amor o con celos algún disgusto le <u>hice</u> , me perdone. (III.260-262)	Si con amor o con celos algún disgusto le <u>hace</u> , me perdone.
No podré mientras no vienen mis hijos. (III.481-482)	¿No podré mientras no vienen mis hijos?

However, there are at least thirty occasions on which the London copy differs from B but coincides with A. In some of these cases it is possible that the printer's own common sense might have dictated an amendment of B, for example:

BThe London Copy

....después  
de hablarme

(II.330)

Cualquier sombra la  
altera

(II.968)

estás en este llanto sordo

(III.985)

....después  
de hablarle

Cualquier sombra le  
altera

estás a este llanto sordo

Amendments of a similar kind are to be found in the London copy on the following occasions: I.382; I.499; II.997; III.951. More often, however, the London copy's deviance from B and concurrence with A suggests that he had both texts in front of him. In the two following cases the superior readings common to A and the London text are definitely not changes which would automatically suggest themselves as solutions to the obvious errors in B:

A and the London Copy

¿De esa respuesta tenías  
alguna duda?

(I.460-461)

digo que este niño vea...  
quien verlos vivos desea

(II.366-367)

B

¿De esa respuesta temas  
alguna duda?

digo que este niño vea...  
quien ver los niños desea

Furthermore, there are several occasions on which the London text appears to follow A, even though the reading offered by B is quite acceptable:

A and the London Copy

que gobierno de mujer,  
¿cómo puede ser discreto?

(I.357-358)

Cualquier sombra le altera  
(II.968)

B

que gobierno de mujer,  
¿cómo pudo ser discreto?

Cualquier sombra la altera

In fact, although there are fifteen readings which the London printer could justifiably have taken from B rather than A, only six of these appear in his text : I.247; I.1113; II.224; II.284; II.422; III.720. In the other cases he opts for



A's version: II.441;I.991;I.576;I.1108;I.1150;II.251;  
II.568.

It is probable, then, that the London printer worked from both A and B, establishing a text of overall superiority by choosing carefully between the readings offered by the two earlier versions. Only the fact that he incorporated three of B's obvious slips, but did not derive any errors from A, indicates that he may have used B as his primary text. The superiority of the London copy as a working text is clinched by its elimination of the major errors common to A and B:

<u>A and B</u>	<u>The London Copy</u>
<u>de lo que penséis</u> me pesa (I.78)	<u>de que lo penséis</u> me pesa
<u>pobra</u> y sola (III.278)	<u>pobre</u> y sola
una camisa de <u>anejo</u> (III.308)	una camisa de <u>angeo</u>
cual hombre que duerme, esta quimera <u>ha</u> compuesto (II.265-266)	cual hombre que duerme, esta quimera <u>he</u> compuesto
con cuanto heredo a mi padre...	con cuanto heredo a mi padre...
le doy <u>todos los demás</u> (III.817-822)	le doy <u>todo lo demás</u>

Therefore, because the printer of the London copy seems to have corrected both A and B, considering with care their alternative readings, I have adopted his version as my primary text. I have rejected the readings which it offers only nine times: on the three occasions when it reproduces an error from B, twice when changes made by Menéndez y Pelayo (Academia edition) were clearly justified (I.424; III.746), once when the London substitution of "abrasado veneno" for "abrasador veneno" (A and B; III.964) was unnecessary, and twice when none of the available texts made sense, and I could see an alternative solution myself (I.197-198; II.868).

With regard to the two more recent texts, D offers very few superior readings, and C none at all. The eighteenth-century manuscript copy (C) made by Isidro Rodríguez

and dated 1733 forms part of a collection which was moved from Spain to Parma in 1748 (see, Antonio Restori, Una collezione di commedie di Lope de Vega (Livorno, 1891), 6 and 27). It seems to be a rather careless copy of B, omitting line 1027 of Act II, and containing several serious errors like the following:

B

¿Piensas que es para reñir?  
(II.1076)

Mi antigua empresa

(II.140)

C

¿Piensas que es para morir?

Mi pobre empresa

Other examples of C's errors are to be found on the following occasions: I.321; I.683; I.1152; II.427; III.244; III.491. The conclusion that Isidro Rodríguez did not check B against A is indicated by the fact that C contains almost all of B's obvious errors and minor variant readings, and only once offers a reading which could have derived from A, but not from B (I.1102).

Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo's version (D) is to be found in Volume XV of the Academia collection, which was published without an introduction. It appears to have been based on A, incorporating two of the three inferior readings offered by this text (I.1102; III.814-815), and following most of its minor variant readings. Of the modifications which Menéndez y Pelayo himself made to the text, the most striking are the change of word order at line 128 of Act I, several unnecessary changes of syntax and vocabulary (eg. II.199; II.635), and the omission of line 829 in Act III. His text does, however, include two helpful amendments (as noted above), and where his modernization of the punctuation helps to make the sense clearer, I have followed it.

I have also modernized spelling except when such changes would have affected prosody or pronunciation. Thus, the old forms quando, vezes, esse etc. are given as cuando, veces and ese, but agora, mochacho and efeto are retained, as are the old forms hablalla (modern hablalla) and dalde (modern dadle).



Footnotes

1. El perro del hortelano, El castigo sin venganza, ed.,  
A. David Kossoff (Madrid, 1970), p. 43. It is relevant  
to note that the fe de erratas in the Madrid version  
does not mention any errors in El mayordomo de la  
Duquesa de Amalfi.

Synopsis of the VersificationAct I

1-50	romance <u>ie</u> (with a refrain at lines 13-14, 27-28, 49-50)
51-175	quintillas
176-479	redondillas
480-487	cuartetos (of seven and eleven syllables): ABBACCDD
488-495	octava (of seven and eleven syllables): ABBCCBDD
496-500	quintilla (of seven and eleven syllables): AABCC
501-828	redondillas
829-842	soneto
843-904	redondillas
905-971	endecasílabas (with internal rhyme)
972-1152	redondillas

Act II

1-210	décimas
211-406	redondillas
407-446	octavas reales
447-630	redondillas
631-718	endecasílabas (free)
719-720	pareado
721-734	soneto
735-904	décimas
905-1104	redondillas
1105-1118	soneto

Act III

1-64	tercetos entrelazados, endecasílabas
65-112	redondillas
113-312	romance <u>eo</u>
313-360	octavas reales
361-460	quintillas
461-572	redondillas



573-652	endecasílabas (free)
653-654	pareado
655-965	redondillas (with prose at lines 734 and 786)
966-1015	romance <u>o</u>

It is interesting to note that the versification of El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi, does, in fact, follow the metrical guide-lines which Lope himself set out in El arte nuevo de hacer comedias (1605-1606?):

Las décimas son buenas para quejas;  
el soneto está bien en los que aguardan;  
las relaciones piden los romances,  
aunque en octavas lucen por extremo.  
Son los tercetos para cosas graves,  
para las de amor las redondillas.  
(ed. Juana de José Prades, Madrid, 1971, 300-305).

The predominance of redondillas is not surprising in a play which lays so much emphasis on the intensity and power of love, unrequited, romantic, matrimonial and parental. The sonnet form does mark climatic points in the action, when the hopes, fears and aspirations of certain characters dictate a mood of tense expectation, and although most of the straightforward narrating is done in romances, the two sets of octavas reales also correspond to relaciones in that they are spoken by characters who are weighing up the consequences of recent events. The use of the romance in the death scene itself is not uncommon in Lope; it presumably reflects his desire to avoid a melodramatic tone by allowing a "prosaic" verse form to predominate.

## Bibliography of Works Cited

### Plays by Lope de Vega

All dates are taken from S.Griswold Morley and Courtney Bruerton, The Chronology of Lope de Vega's comedias (The Modern Language Association of America), London, 1940.

- Adonis y Venus (1597-1603), Ac.VI  
Aldegüela, el (1612-1614), Ac.XII  
Almenas de Toro, las (1610-1619), Ac.VIII  
Al pasar del arroyo (1616), Ac.N.XI  
Amar por burla (of doubtful authenticity), Ac.N.I  
Amor secreto hasta celos (1612-1615), Ac.N.III  
Anzuelo de Fenisa, el (1604-1606), Ac.XIV  
Arminda celosa (1608-1615), Ac.N.I  
Bandos de Sena, los (1597-1603), Ac.N.III  
Bastardo Mudarra, el (1612), Ac.VII  
Bella Aurora, la (1620-1625), Ac.VI  
Boda entre dos maridos, la (1595-1603), Ac.XIV  
Burgalesa de Lerma, la (1613?), Ac.N.IV  
Caballero de Illescas, el (1602), Ac.N.IV  
Caballero del milagro (1593-1598), Ac,N.IV  
Caballero de Olmedo, el (1620-1625), Ac.X  
Castelvines y Monteses (1606-1612), Ac.XV  
Castigo del discreto, el (1606-1608), ed.William L.Fichter (New York, 1925)  
Castigo sin venganza, el (1631), ed.C.F.A.Van Dam (Salamanca, 1968)  
Comendadores de Córdoba, los (1596-1598), Ac.XI  
Conde Fernán González, el (1610-1612), Ac.VII  
Cuerdo en su casa, el (1606-1608), Ac.N.XI  
Dama boba, la (1613), Ac.N.XI  
Desdén vengado, el (1617), Ac.XV  
Desdichada Estefanía, la (1604), Ac.XV  
Difunta pleitada, la (1593-1595), Ac.N.IV  
Dineros son calidad, los (of doubtful authenticity; 1620-1623?), Ac.N.XII  
Discreta enamorada, la (1604-1608), Ac.XIV  
Dómine Lucas, el (1590-1595), Ac.N.XII



Doncella Teodor, la (1610-1612), Ac. XIV  
Duque de Viseo, el (1604-1610), Ac. X  
Ejemplo de casadas, el (1599-1603), Ac. XV  
Embustes de Celauro, los (1599-1603), Ac. N. XII  
Esclava de su galán, la (1626?), Ac. N. XII  
Estrella de Sevilla, la (of doubtful authenticity), ed. H. Thomas (Oxford, 1923).  
Favor agradecido, el (1593), Ac. N. V  
Flores de don Juan y rico y pobre trocados, las (1612-1615), Ac. N. XII  
Fuenteovejuna (1612-1614), Ac. X  
Fuerza lastimosa, la (1595-1603), Ac. XIV  
Galán escarmentado, el (1595-1598), Ac. N. I  
Genovés liberal, el (1599-1603), Ac. N. VI  
Guante de doña Blanca, la (1627-1635), Ac. IX  
Hamete de Toledo, el (1608-1610), Ac. N. VI  
Hermosa Alfreda, la (1598-1600), Ac. N. VI  
Hermosa Ester, la (1610), Ac. III  
Hermosa fea, la (1630-1632), Ac. N. XII  
Hidalgos del aldea, los (1608-1611), Ac. N. VI  
Honrado hermano, el (1598-1600), Ac. VI  
Infanta desesperada, la (1588-1595), Ac. N. I  
Inocente Laura, la (1604-1608), Ac. N. XII  
Justas de Tebas (before 1596), Ac. N. I  
Lacayo fingido, el (1599-1603), Ac. N. VII  
Laura perseguida (1594), Ac. N. VII  
Lo que está determinado (1613-1619?), Ac. N. VII  
Lucinda perseguida (1599-1602), Ac. N. VII  
Mármol de Felisardo, el (1594-1598?), Ac. XIV  
Marqués de Mantua, el (1600-1602), Ac. XIII  
Más pueden celos que amor (ca. 1627), Ac. N. XII  
Mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi, el (1604-1606), Ac. XV  
Mayor victoria, la (1615-1624), Ac. XV  
Mejor alcalde el Rey, el (1620-1623), Ac. VIII  
Mejor mozo de España, el (1610-1611), Ac. X  
Mesón de la corte, el (1588-1595), Ac. N. I  
Milagros del desprecio, los (1599-1603), Ac. N. XIII  
Moza de cántaro, la (before 1627), Ac. N. XIII  
Mujeres sin hombres, las (1613-1618), Ac. VI  
Nardo Antonio, bandolero (of doubtful authenticity; 1610-1625), Ac. N. VIII

- Necedad del discreto, la (1613?), Ac.N.VIII  
Niña de plata, la (1610-1612), Ac.IX  
Nobles como han de ser, los (of doubtful authenticity; 1625-1635?), Ac.N.VIII  
No son todos ruiñeñores (ca.1630), Ac.XV  
Novios de Hornachuelos, los (of doubtful authenticity), Ac.X  
Padrino desposado, el (1598-1600), Ac.N.VIII  
Paraíso de Laura y florestas de amor, el (1625?), Ac.N.VIII  
Pedro carbonero (1603), Ac.XI  
Pedro de Urdemalas (of doubtful authenticity; 1597-1605?), Ac.N.VIII  
Peribañez y el comendador de Ocaña (1610), Ac.X  
Perro del hortelano, el (1613?), ed.A. David Kossoff (Madrid, 1970).  
Perseguido, el (before 1596), Ac.XV  
Piadoso aragonés, el (1626), Ac.X  
Piadoso veneciano, el (1599-1608), Ac.X  
Porfiar hasta morir (1624-1628), Ac.X  
Por la puente Juana (1624-1630), Ac.N.XIII  
Prados de León, los (1604-1606), Ac.VII  
Premio de la hermosura, el (1610-1618), Ac.XIII  
Príncipe despeñado, el (1602), Ac.VIII  
Querer la propia desdicha (1619-1620), Ac.N.XIII  
Quien más no puede (1616), Ac.N.IX  
Quinta de Florencia, la (1600?), Ac.XV  
Reina doña María, la (of doubtful authenticity; 1604-1608), Ac.VIII  
Resistencia honrada, la (1599-1603), Ac.N.IX  
Rey por semejanza, el (of doubtful authenticity; 1599-1603?), Ac.N.II  
Rey sin reino, el (1597-1612), Ac.VI  
Ruiñeñor de Sevilla, el (1604-1608), Ac.XV  
Secretario de sí mismo, el (1604-1606), Ac.XV  
Sembrar en buena tierra, el (1616), Ac.N.IX  
Serrana de Tormes, la (1590?-1595), Ac.N.IX  
Servir a señor discreto (1610-1612), Ac.XV  
Silencio agradecido, el (1598-1606), Ac.N.IX  
¡Si no vieran las mujeres! (1631-1632), Ac.XV  
Soldado amante, el (1593-1595), Ac.N.IX  
Valiente Céspedes, el (1612-1615), Ac.XII



Varona castellana, la (1597-1603), Ac.VIII

Vengadora de las mujeres, la (1615-1620), Ac.N.XIII

Villano en su rincón, el (1611), ed. Joaquín de Entrambasaguas,  
Lope de Vega y su tiempo, 2 vols (Barcelona, 1961)

Viuda valenciana, la (1595-1603), ed. José Luis Aguirre  
(Madrid, 1967)

Plays by Other Dramatists

Argensola, Lupercio Leonardo de, Alejandra (1581-1585?)

Isabela (1581-1585?)

Both edited by José Manuel Blecua, Rimas de  
Lupercio y Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, 2 vols  
(Zaragoza, 1950)

Bermúdez, Jerónimo, Nise lastimosa (published 1577)

Nise laureada (published 1577)

Both edited by L.F. de Moratín, Piezas dramáticas  
anteriores a Lope de Vega, 6 vols (Paris, 1838), vol. I

Castro, Diego López de, Marco Antonio y Cleopatra (1582),

ed. Hugo A. Rennert, Revue Hispanique, XIX (1908), 184-237

Cueva, Juan de la, Comedias y tragedias (published 1588),

ed. Francisco A. de Icaza (Madrid, 1917)

Farsa a manera de tragedia, anon. (published 1537), ed.

Hugo A. Rennert, Revue Hispanique, XXV (1911), 283-316

Horne, Henry, The Tragedy of the Duchess of Malfi (London,  
1850)

Lasso de la Vega, Gabriel Lobo, La honra de Dido restaurada,

in Primera parte del romancero y tragedias (1587)

Moreto y Cabaña, Agustín, El desdén con el desdén (1654),

ed. Jack H. Parker (Salamanca, 1970)

El lindo don Diego (1651), ed.

A.V. Ebersole (Madrid, 1968)

Muxet de Solís, Diego, Comedia de la venganza de la

Duquesa de Amalfi, in Comedias humanas y divinas  
(Brussels, 1624)

Oliva, Fernán Pérez de, Hécuba triste (published 1585)

Rey de Artieda, Andrés, Los amantes (published 1581), ed.

Francisco Carreres y Vallo (Valencia, 1908)

Rojas Zowwa, Francisco de, Entre bobos anda el juego

(published 1654), ed. F. Ruiz Morcuende (Madrid, 1917)

Rueda, Lope de, Los engaños (published 1567)

Eufemia (published 1567)

Both edited by E. Cotarelo y Mori, 2 vols (Madrid, 1908)

Solís y Rivadeneyra, Antonio, El amor al uso (published 1652)

Theobald, Lewis, The Fatal Secret (London, 1735)

Torres Naharro, Bartolomé de, La comedia Serafina (published 1533), ed. Joseph E. Gillet, 4 vols (Pennsylvania, 1943), vol. II

Vega, Alonso de la, Tragedia llamada Serafina (published 1566), ed. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, Gesellschaft für Romanische Literatur, VI (1905)

Villaviciosa, Sebastián de, Cuántas veo, tantas quiero (published 1652)

Virués, Cristóbal de, Elisa Dido (published 1609)

La gran Semiramis (published 1609)

Both edited by Eduardo Julia Martínez, Poetas dramáticos valencianos (Madrid, 1929)

Webster, John, The White Devil (1611-1612?)

The Duchess of Malfi (1613-1614?)

Both edited by F. L. Lucas, The Complete Works of John Webster, 4 vols (London, 1927), vol. I

#### Other Texts of the Period

Albornoz, Bartolomé de, Arte de los contractos (Valencia, 1573)

Alfonso el Sabio, Las siete partidas, ed. D. de Montalvo (Seville, 1491)

Ávila, Juan de, Avisos y reglas cristianos sobre aquel verso de David "Audi, filia" (Toledo, 1556), ed. Luis Salas Balust (Barcelona, 1963)

Azpilcueta Navarro, Martín de, Manual de confesores y penitentes (Salamanca, 1557)

Bandello, Matteo, Tutte le opere, ed. Arnoldo Mondadori, 2 vols (Italy, 1934)

Barrionuevo de Peralta, Jerónimo de, Avisos 1654-1658 (Madrid, 1659), ed. A. Paz y Melia, 4 vols (Madrid, 1894)

Belleforest, François, and Pierre Boisteau, Histoires tragiques mises en notre langue française (Paris, 1559-1582)



- Boccaccio, Giovanni, Il Decamerone, ed. Vittoria Branca (Verona, 1974)
- Brunel, Antoine de, Voyage en Espagne (Paris, 1665), ed. Charles Claverie, Revue Hispanique, XXX (1914), 119-375
- Cartagena, Alonso de, El doctrial de los caballeros (Toledo, 1487)
- Cascales, Francisco, Tablas poéticas (Murcia, 1617)
- Castiglione, Baldassare, Il libro del cortegiano (Venice, 1528), ed. Vittorio Cian (Florence, 1947)
- Celso, Hugo de, Las leyes de todos los reinos de Castilla y León (Valladolid, 1538)
- Coras, Jean de, Paraphrase sur l'edict des mariages clandestinement contractés par les enfants de famille contre la gré et consentement de leurs pères et mères (Paris, 1572)
- Correas Íñigo, Gonzalo de, Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales (published Real Academia, Madrid, 1906)
- Cortés, Jerónimo, Fisonomía y varios secretos de la naturaleza (Tarragona, 1609)  
Libro y tratado de los animales terrestres (Valencia, 1613)
- Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio, Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España (Madrid, 1904)
- Covarrubias Orozco, Juan de, Emblemas morales (Segovia, 1589)
- Covarrubias Orozco, Sebastián de, Emblemas morales (Madrid, 1610)  
Tesoro de la lengua castellana (Madrid, 1611)
- Cueva, Juan de la, Ejemplar poético (Seville, 1582), ed. Juan Joseph López de Sedano, Colección de poesías escogidas de los más célebres poetas castellanos (Madrid, 1774), vol. VIII
- Day, Angel, The English Secretary (London, 1586)
- Espinosa, Juan de, Diálogo en laude de las mujeres (Milan, 1580), ed. Ángela González Simón, Biblioteca de antiguos libros hispánicos (Madrid, 1946), vol. VII
- Faret, Nicolas, L'Honnête homme, ou l'art de plaire à la cour (Antwerp, 1632?)

- Fuentes, Alonso de, Suma de filosofía natural (Seville, 1547)
- Garzoni, Tommaso, La piazza universale (Venice, 1585)
- González de Salas, Jusepe Antonio, Nueva idea de la tragedia antigua (Madrid, 1633)
- Granada, Luis de, Compendio de la doctrina cristiana (Lisbon, 1559), ed. Fr. Justo Cuervo, Obras de Fray Luis de Granada (Madrid, 1906), vol. XIII
- Guardiola, Juan Benito, Tratado de nobleza (Madrid, 1591)
- Guazzo, Stefano, La civile conversazione (Brescia, 1574)
- Guevara, Antonio de, Epístolas familiares (Salamanca, 1578)  
El reloj de príncipes y libro de Marco Aurelio (1529), ed. Ángel Rosenblat (Madrid, 1936)
- Guibelet, Jourdain, Examen de l'examen des esprits (Paris, 1631)
- Hermosilla, Diego de, Diálogo de los pajes (1571-1573?), ed. A. Rodríguez Villa (Madrid, 1901)
- Huarte, Juan, El examen de ingenios (Baeza, 1575), ed. Rodrigo Sanz (Madrid, 1930)
- Humphrey, Laurence, The Nobles (London, 1563)
- Ledesma, Pedro de, Suma de los sacramentos (Salamanca, 1601)
- Lemerre, Pierre, Justifications des usages de France sur les mariages des enfants de famille, faits sans le consentement de leurs parents (Paris, 1687)
- Leyes de Toro, las, glossed by Miguel de Cifuentes (Medina del Campo, 1546)
- Lifán y Verdugo, Antonio, Guía y avisos de forasteros (Valencia, 1635)
- López de Ayala, Ignacio, El sacrosanto y ecuménico Concilio de Trento (Madrid, 1564)
- López Pinciano, Alonso, Filosofía antigua poética (Madrid, 1596)
- Luján, Pedro de, Coloquios matrimoniales (Seville, 1550)
- Mariana, Juan de, Historia general de España, 2 vols (Toledo, 1601)
- Marqués, Antonio, Afeite y mundo mujeril (Madrid, 1617), ed. Fernando Rubio (Barcelona, 1964)
- Mercado, Pedro de, Diálogos de filosofía natural y moral (Granada, 1574)
- Mercado, Tomás de, Tratos y contratos de mercaderes (Salamanca, 1569)
- Mexía, Fernando de, El libro de la nobleza (Medina del Campo, 1492)



- Mexía, Pedro de, Silva de varia lección (Valladolid, 1550), ed. Justo García Soriano, 2 vols (Madrid, 1933)
- Mexía, Vicente, Saludable instrucción del estado de matrimonio (Córdoba, 1566)
- Miraval, Blas Álvarez, La conservación de la salud del cuerpo y del alma (Medina del Campo, 1597)
- Moncada, Sancho de, Restauración política de España (Madrid, 1619)
- Moreno de Vargas, Bernarbé, Discursos de la nobleza de España (Madrid, 1622)
- Muret, Jean de, Lettres écrites de Madrid en 1666 et 1667, ed. M.A. Morel-Fatio (Paris, 1877)
- Nueva recopilación de las leyes de estos reinos, hecha por mandado del rey Felipe segundo (Alcalá de Henares, 1564)
- Núñez, Francisco, El libro intitulado del parto humano (Alcalá de Henares, 1693)
- Ossuna, Francisco de, El norte de los estados (Burgos, 1550)
- Peacham, Henry, The Complete Gentleman (London, 1622), ed. Virgil B. Hettzel (New York, 1962)
- Peñalosa y Mondragón, Benito de, El libro de las cinco excelencias del español (Pamplona, 1629)
- Pérez del Barrio Ángulo, Gabriel, Dirección de secretarios de señores (Madrid, 1613)
- Pérez de Moya, Juan, Comparaciones o símiles para los vicios y virtudes (Alcalá de Henares, 1584)  
Filosofía secreta (Zaragoza, 1585)  
Varia historia de santas e ilustres mujeres (Zaragoza, 1599), ed. Eduardo Gómez de Baquero (Madrid, 1928)
- Prado, Mateo de, Manual de grandes (Madrid, 1640)
- Provincial, El, Las coplas (1465-1474?), ed. R. Foulché-Delbosc, Revue Hispanique, V (1898), 255-266
- Pulgar, Fernando de, Crónica de los Reyes Católicos (Zaragoza, 1565), ed. Juan de M. Carriazo (Madrid, 1943)  
Letras de Fernando de Pulgar (Toledo, 1480), BAE. XIII
- Rufo Gutiérrez, Juan, Las seiscientas apotegmas (Toledo, 1596), ed. Agustín González de Amezúa y Mayo (Madrid, 1923)
- Rufo Gutiérrez, Luis, Las quinientas apotegmas (Toledo, 1600)

Sabuco, Oliva, Nueva filosofía de la naturaleza (Madrid, 1588)

Salas Barbadillo, Alonso Jerónimo de, La casa del placer honesto (Madrid, 1602)

El perfecto caballero (Madrid, 1620), ed. Pauline Marshall (Colorado, 1949)

Salazar, Ambrosio de, Libro curioso (Paris, 1635)

Sánchez, Tomás, De sancto matrimonii sacramento (Madrid, 1602-1605)

Santa Cruz y Dueñas, Melchor de, Floresta española (Toledo, 1574), ed. Hernán López de Yanguas (Madrid, 1953)

Libro de los cien tratados (Toledo, 1576)

Saravia de la Calle, [?], Instrucción de mercaderes (Medina del Campo, 1544)

Soto, Hernando de, Emblemas moralizadas (Madrid, 1599)

Suárez de Figueroa, Cristóbal, La plaza universal (Madrid, 1615)

Torquemada, Antonio de, Los coloquios satíricos (Bilbao, 1584)

El jardín de flores curiosas (Salamanca, 1570), ed. Agustín González de Amezúa y Mayo (Madrid, 1943)

Tratado de nobleza, anon., MS.12598 (Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid)

Valera, Mosén Diego de, Crónica de los Reyes Católicos (1482-1488?), ed. Juan de M. Carriazo, Revista de Filología, VIII (1927), 5-285

Vega Carpio, Félix Lope de, El arte nuevo de hacer comedias (1605-1606), ed. Juana de José Prades (Madrid, 1971)

Velázquez, Baltasar Mateo, El filósofo del aldea y sus conversaciones familiares (Pamplona, 1626), ed. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, Colección selecta de antiguas novelas españolas (Madrid, 1906), vol. IV

Villena, Enrique de, Los doce trabajos de Hércules (Toledo, 1483)

Vitoria, Baltasar de, Del teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad, 2 vols (Madrid, 1676)

Zabaleta, Juan de, El día de fiesta por la mañana y por la tarde (Madrid, 1654), ed. A. R. Chaves, Colección de los mejores autores antiguos y modernos (Madrid, 1885), Vol. CIII.



Zapata, Luis de, Varia historia (Madrid, 1589), ed. G.C.  
Horseman (Amsterdam, 1935)

Critical Studies

- Amezúa y Mayo, Agustín González de, Cervantes, creador de la novela corta española, 2 vols (Madrid, 1956)  
Lope de Vega en sus cartas: epistolario de Lope de Vega, 4 vols (Madrid, 1935)
- Arco y Garay, Ricardo del, La sociedad española en las obras dramáticas de Lope de Vega (Madrid, 1941)
- Arjona, J.H., "El disfraz varonil en Lope de Vega", Bulletin Hispanique, XXXIX (1937), 120-145
- Aylen, Leo, "The Vulgarly of Tragedy", in Classical Drama and its Influence. Essays Presented to H.D.F. Kitto, ed. M.J. Anderson (Great Britain, 1965), 85-101
- Bataillon, Marcel, "Cervantes et le mariage chrétien", Bulletin Hispanique, XLIX (1947), 129-144  
"Matrimonios cervantinos. Ortodoxia humana", Realidad, II (1947), 171-182  
"El villano en su rincón", Bulletin Hispanique, LI (1949), 5-38
- Beneyto Pérez, Juan, Historia social de España y Hispanoamérica (Madrid, 1961)
- Bitton, Davis, The French Nobility in Crisis, 1560-1640 (California, 1969)
- Bogard, Travis, The Tragic Satire of John Webster (Los Angeles, 1955)
- Boklund, Gunnar, The Duchess of Malfi: Sources, Themes, Characters (Massachusetts, 1962)
- Bomli, P.W., La femme dans l'Espagne du siècle d'or (The Hague, 1950)
- Bourland, Caroline B., The Short Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century (Massachusetts, 1927)
- Bradbrook, M.C., Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, 1935)
- Braudel, F., La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen (Paris, 1966)
- Bravo-Villasante, Carmen, La mujer vestida de hombre en el teatro español: siglos XVI-XVII (Madrid, 1955)

- Brenes, Carmen Olga, El sentimiento democrático en el teatro de Juan Ruiz de Alarcón (California, 1960)
- Brennan, Elizabeth, "The Relationship between Brother and Sister in the Plays of John Webster", Modern Language Review, LVIII (1963), 488-494
- Brinkman, Gabriel, The Social Thought of John of Lugo, The Catholic University of America Studies in Sociology, no. 41 (Washington, 1957)
- Brown, J.R., ed. The Duchess of Malfi, Revels Plays (London, 1963)
- Burke, Peter, Culture and Society in Renaissance Italy, 1420-1540 (London, 1972)
- Camera, Matteo, Memorie storico-diplomatiche dell'antica città e ducato di Amalfi, 2 vols (Salerno, 1876-1881)
- Casa, Frank P., The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Moreto (Cambridge, 1966)
- Castro, Américo, El pensamiento de Cervantes (Madrid, 1925)
- Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio, Bibliografía de las controversias sobre la licitud del teatro en España (Madrid, 1904)
- Cushman Davis, James, The Decline of the Nobility as a Ruling Class, The John Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, no. LXXX (Baltimore, 1962)
- Dent, R.W., John Webster's Borrowing (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960)
- Descouzis, Paul M., "El matrimonio en el Quijote - influjo tridentino", Torre, LXIV (1969), 35-45
- Domínguez Ortiz, Antonio, La sociedad española en el siglo XVII (Madrid, 1963)
- The Golden Age of Spain, 1516-1659, trans. James Casey (London, 1971)
- Doucet, Roger, Les institutions de la France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, 2 vols (Paris, 1948)
- Dunlop, J.C., The History of Prose Fiction, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1816)
- Edwards, W.A., "John Webster", Scrutiny II (1933), 12-23
- Elliot, J.H., Imperial Spain 1469-1716 (London, 1963)
- Ellis-Fermor, Una, The Jacobean Drama (London, 1953)
- Farinelli, Arturo, Italia e Spagna (Torino, 1929)
- Fichter, L., "Color Symbolism in Lope de Vega", Romanic Review, XVIII (1927), 220-231



- Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Julia, "Woman in Sixteenth-Century Spain",  
Revue Hispanique, LXX (1927), 557-634
- Gasparetti, Antonio, "Giovan Battista Giraldi e Lope de Vega", Bulletin Hispanique, XXXII (1930), 372-403
- Las novelas de Bandello como fuentes del teatro de Lope (Salamanca, 1939)
- Green, Otis H., Courtly Love in Quevedo (Boulder, 1952)
- "Sobre las dos fortunas: de tejas arriba y de tejas abajo", in Studia Philologica: Homenaje a Dámaso Alonso, ed. A. Zamora Vicente (Madrid, 1961), 143-154
- Goyri de Menéndez Pidal, María, La difunta pleitada: estudio de literatura comparativa (Madrid, 1909)
- Griffith, T. G., Bandello's Fiction (Oxford, 1955)
- Halstead, H. G., "The Attitude of Lope de Vega toward Astrology and Astronomy", Hispanic Review, VII (1939), 205-219
- Hayes, Francis C., "Lope de Vega and the Common Man", in South Atlantic Studies for Sturgis E. Leavitt, ed. Thomas B. Stroup and Sterling A. Stoudemire (New York, 1972), 71-79
- Hermenegildo, Alfredo, Los trágicos españoles del siglo dieciséis (Madrid, 1961)
- Herrero-García, M., "La ideología española de la nobleza", Revista de Filología Española, XIV (1927), 161-175
- Herrick, Marvin J., Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century (Illinois, 1964)
- Hook, Frank S., The French Bandello, University of Missouri Studies, no. 22 (Missouri, 1948)
- Houseman, J. E., Parallel Plots in English and Spanish Drama of the Early Seventeenth Century, unpublished doctoral thesis (University of London, 1951)
- Huxley, Aldous L., "Tragedy and the Whole Truth", in Collected Essays (New York, 1958), 96-103
- Jammes, R., Études sur l'oeuvre poétique de D. Luis de Góngora y Argote (Bordeaux, 1967)
- Jones, R. O., "El perro del hortelano y la visión de Lope", Filología, X (1964), 135-142
- "Poets and Peasants", in Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez (Madrid, 1971), 341-355

- Joyce, G.H., Christian Marriage: an Historical and Doctrinal Study (London, 1948)
- Keniston, Hayward, Francisco de los Cobos: Secretary of the Emperor Charles V (Pittsburgh, 1960)
- Kiesow, Karl, "Die verschiedenen Bearbeitungen der Novelle von der Herzogin von Amalfi des Bandello in den Literaturen des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts", Anglia, XVII (1895), 199-258
- Koenigsberger, Helmut Georg, and George Lachmann Mosse, Europe in the Sixteenth Century (London, 1968)
- Kohler, Eugène, "Lope et Bandello", in Hommage à Ernest Martinenche. Études hispaniques et américaines (Paris, 1939), 116-142
- Krappe, Alexander Haggerty, "The Legend of the Glove", Modern Language Notes, XXXIV (1919), 16-23
- Lapeyre, Henri, Une famille de marchands, les Ruiz (Paris-Bordeaux, 1955)
- Lee Kennedy, Ruth, The Dramatic Art of Moreto (Cambridge, 1966)
- Leech, C., Webster: The Duchess of Malfi (London, 1963)
- Lewis, Clive Staples, A Grief Observed (London, 1964)
- Ley, C.D., "Lope de Vega y la tragedia", Clavileño, I (1950), 9-12
- Loftis, John, "The Duchess of Malfi on the Spanish and English Stages", Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama, XII (1969), 25-31
- Lucas, F.L., The Complete Works of John Webster, 4 vols (London, 1927)
- Lynch, John, Spain under the Hapsburgs, 2 vols (Oxford, 1965-1969)
- Marañón y Posadillo, Gregorio, Don Juan en el teatro, en la novela, y en la vida (Buenos Aires, 1942)
- Ensayo biológico sobre Enrique IV de Castilla y su tiempo (Madrid, 1930)
- Maraval y Casenoves, José Antonio, Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca (Madrid, 1972)
- Matulka, Barbara, "The Feminist Theme", Romanic Review, XXVI (1935), 191-231



- M.<sup>c</sup>Curdy, Raymond R., "Lope de Vega y la pretendida inhabilidad española para la tragedia: resumen crítico", in Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez (Madrid, 1971), 525-535
- M.<sup>c</sup>Kendrick, Melveena, Woman and Society in the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age. A Study of the Mujer Varonil (Cambridge, 1974)
- Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino, Orígenes de la novela (Santander, 1943), vols XIII-XVI
- Moir, Duncan W., "The Classical Tradition in Spanish Dramatic Theory and Practice in the Seventeenth Century", in Classical Drama and its Influence: Essays Presented to H.D.F. Kitto (London, 1965), 191-228
- "Lope de Vega's Fuenteovejuna and the Emblemas morales of Sebastián de Covarrubias Horozco (with a Few Remarks on El villano en su rincón)", in Homenaje a William L. Fichter, ed. A. David Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez (Madrid, 1971), 537-546
- Montoto, Santiago, "Lope de Vega y la nobleza", Boletín de la Real Academia, XXII (1935), 657-665
- Morby, E.S., "Some Observations on tragedia and tragicomedia in Lope", Hispanic Review, XI (1943), 185-209
- Morellini, Domenico, "La fonte di alcuni successi de' MSS. Corona", Napoli Nobilissima, XIV (1905), 77-79
- Giovanna d'Aragona, Duchessa d'Amalfi: spigolature storiche e letterarie (a proposito d'una novella di Matteo Bandello) (Cesena, 1906)
- Morely, S. Griswold and Courtney Bruerton, The Chronology of Lope de Vega's comedias, The Modern Language Association of America (London, 1940)
- Nicol, Bernard de Bear, Varieties of Dramatic Experience (London, 1969)
- Ogg, David, Europe in the Seventeenth Century (London, 1952)
- Parker, A.A., "The Spanish Drama of the Golden Age: a Method of Analysis and Interpretation", in The Great Playwrights. Twenty-Five Plays with Commentaries by Critics and Scholars, ed. Eric Bentley (New York, 1970), I, 697-707
- Patrides, C.A., "The Scale of Nature and Renaissance Treatises on Nobility", Studia Neophilologica, XXXVI (1964), 63-68

- Pérez, Luis C., and F. Sánchez Escribano, Afirmaciones de Lope de Vega sobre preceptiva dramática a base de cien comedias (Madrid, 1961)
- Perott, José de, "La guante de la dama", Revista de Filología Española, VI (1919), 63-64
- Pike, Ruth, Aristocrats and Traders: Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century (Cornell, 1972)
- Pilar Oñate, María del, El feminismo en la literatura española (Madrid, 1938)
- Piluso, Roberto V., Amor, matrimonio y honra en Cervantes (New York, 1967)
- Pruvost, René, Matteo Bandello and Elizabethan Fiction (Paris, 1937)
- Restori, Antonio, Una collezione di commedie di Lope de Vega Carpio (Livorno, 1891)
- Ribner, Irving, "Webster's Italian Tragedies", Tulane Drama Review, V (1961), 106-118
- Romera-Navarro, M., "Las disfrazadas de varón en la comedia", Hispanic Review, II (1934), 269-286
- Ruiz de Conde, Justina, El amor y el matrimonio secreto en los libros de caballerías (Madrid, 1948)
- Sage, Jack W., Lope de Vega: El caballero de Olmedo, Critical Guides to Spanish Texts (London, 1974)
- "The Context of Comedy. Lope de Vega's El perro del hortelano and Related Plays", in Studies in Spanish Literature of the Golden Age Presented to Edward M. Wilson, ed. R. O. Jones (London, 1973), 247-266
- Salomon, Noël, Recherches sur le thème paysan dans la "comedia" au temps de Lope de Vega (Bordeaux, 1965)
- Sánchez Escribano, F., and A. Porqueras Mayo, Preceptiva dramática española del Renacimiento y el Barroco (Madrid, 1965)
- Schack, Adolf Friedrich von, Geschichte der dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien, 3 vols (Frankfurt-on-Main, 1854), trans. E. de Mier, Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España, 5 vols (Madrid, 1885-1887)
- Schwartz, E., "The Possibilities of Christian Tragedy", College English, XXI (1960), 208-212



- Sicroff, Albert A., Les controverses des status de "pureté de sang" en Espagne du XV<sup>e</sup> au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle (Paris, 1960)
- Steiner, George, The Death of Tragedy (London, 1961)
- Stone, Lawrence, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965)
- ed. Social Change and Revolution in England, 1540-1640, Problems and Perspectives in History (London, 1965)
- Sturel, René, Bandello en France (Bordeaux, 1918)
- Thayer, C.G., "The Ambiguity of Bosola", Studies in Philology, LIV (1957), 162-171
- Treasure, G.R.R., Seventeenth-Century France (London, 1966)
- Trueblood, Alan S., Experience and Artistic Expression in Lope de Vega: the Making of La Dorotea (Cambridge-Massachusetts, 1974)
- Tucci, Ugo, "The Psychology of the Venetian Merchant in the Sixteenth Century", in Renaissance Venice, ed. J.R.Hale (London, 1973), 315-337
- Varey, John E., "Towards an Interpretation of Lope de Vega's El villano en su rincón", in Studies in Spanish Literature of the Golden Age: Presented to Edward M. Wilson, ed. R.O. Jones (London, 1973), 315-337
- Vosters, Simon A., "Lope de Vega y las damas doctas", in Actas del tercer congreso internacional de hispanistas, ed. Carlos H. Magis (Mexico, 1970), 909-921
- Wadsworth, F.W., "Webster's Duchess of Malfi in the Light of Some Contemporary Ideas on Marriage and Remarriage", Philological Quarterly, XXXV (1956), 397-407
- Wardropper, B.W., "Comic Illusion in Lope de Vega's El perro del hortelano", Kentucky Romance Quarterly, XIV (1967), 101-111
- Watson, A. Irvine, "El pintor de su deshonor and the Neo-Aristotelian Theory of Tragedy", Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XL (1963), 17-34
- Wilson, Edward M., and Duncan Moir, A Literary History of Spain. The Golden Age: Drama 1492-1700 (London and New York, 1971)
- Wright, Louis B., "A Conduct Book for Malvolio", Studies in Philology, XXII (1934), 115-132

PART II



El mayordomo de la Duquesa de Amalfi

Hablan en ella las personas siguientes.

<u>Antonio mayordomo</u>	<u>Villanos</u>
La Duquesa de Amalfi	Melampo
Otavio de Médicis	Doristo
Fabricio <u>criado</u>	Arsindo
Urbino <u>secretario de la</u>	<u>Criados</u>
<u>Duquesa</u>	Furio
Celso <u>viejo</u>	Dinarco
Libia <u>camarera</u>	Filelfo
Bartola	Ruperto
Fenicio	Bernardo
Lucindo	<u>Niños</u>
Julio de Aragón	Alejandro
El Duque de Amalfi	Leonora

Acto primero

Sale Antonio.

Antonio      Desiguales prendas mías,  
pues al sol os atrevistes,  
bien es que tengáis el pago,  
y que la tierra os<sup>1</sup> eclipse;  
ojos que mirar osastes  
sus rayos inaccesibles  
Ícaros de mi deseo,  
con alas de plumas viles;  
caed del cielo sereno,  
donde sin fuerza subistes,  
al mar de mi justo llanto,  
en que la esperanza expire.  
¡Ay, prendas mías humildes,  
fuego merece quien al viento sigue!

5

10

De la Duquesa de Amalfi 15  
 osaron mis ojos libres,<sup>1</sup>  
 siendo un hombre su criado,  
 siendo un hombre que la sirve,  
 mirar los divinos rayos.  
 Diome licencia,atrevíme; 20  
 que me llamó con mirarme,  
 que amor tiene ojos de lince;  
 y aunque no me dice nada,  
 mucho mirando me dice,  
 pues me ha obligado a querer 25  
 aquel divino imposible.  
 ¡Ay,prendas mías humildes,  
 fuego merece quien al viento sigue!  
 Nací en Nápoles hidalgo,  
 estudié,profesión hice 30  
 de gentilhombre en la corte:  
 ¡qué principios y que fines!  
 Federico de Aragón  
 era su rey infelice:  
 echáronle de su estado; 35  
 seguí su destierro,¡ay triste!  
 Amparóle Luis de Francia;  
 canséme;a Nápoles vine;  
 en mi humildad descansaba;  
 rico él que contento vive. 40  
 Como enviudó la Duquesa,  
 y el hijo es niño,me pide  
 por cartas que a su servicio  
 o a su gobierno me incline.  
 Nunca yo lo imaginara, 45  
 pues aunque con ella prive,  
 quieren mis locos deseos  
 que a pretenderla me anime.  
 ¡Ay,prendas mías humildes  
 fuego merece quien al viento sigue! 50

Salen Otavio de Médicis y criados.

1. D:osaron mis ojos libres/de la Duquesa de Amalfi



Otavio           ¿Vino Antonio?

Fabricio                       Sí, señor.

Antonio           Aquí esperando<sup>1</sup> estaba.

Otavio           Debes, amigo, a mi amor  
ese cuidado; hoy se acaba  
de mi esperanza el temor;                       55  
hoy pone a su fundamento  
de tan<sup>2</sup> rica posesión  
la primer piedra mi intento.

Antonio           Temo que esta pretensión  
debe de ser casamiento.                       60

Otavio           No estéis vosotros aquí.

Antonio           ¿Qué es, señor, lo que me quieres?

Otavio           Escúchame atento.

Antonio                       Di.

Otavio           Antonio, yo sé quién eres;  
¿sabes quién soy?

Antonio                       Señor, sí.                       65

Otavio           Con eso sabrás que soy  
del gran Duque de Florencia  
sobrino.

Antonio           Más gloria os doy  
por vuestra virtud.

Otavio                       Mi herencia  
no la sé: a figura estoy                       70  
desde que el Duque murió,  
él de Amalfi, Antonio, digo;  
aunque heredero dejó  
traigo pensado conmigo...

Antonio

[Aparte].

                  No en vano el alma temió.                       75

Otavio           Casarme con la Duquesa.

Antonio           Por deciros la verdad,  
de que lo<sup>3</sup> penséis me pesa,  
si es bien que con libertad  
hable él que verdad profesa;                       80

1. D: esperándote

2. C: su

3. A, B, C: de lo que

que aunque la Duquesa mía  
es bella y moza, ese día  
que el casar le dé cuidado,  
de su hijo y de su estado  
perderá la tutoría.

85

Pues pobre y sin heredar,  
¿qué habéis de hacer?

Otavio

Esperar

al lado de una mujer  
que me puede enriquecer  
con que se deje mirar.

90

Antonio

Bien entiendo que es amor,  
Señor Otavio, él que os mueve;  
pero todo ese rigor  
es como Julio, que llueve  
para acrecentar calor.

95

Pasará la tempestad;  
al primero mes de mesa  
vendrá la serenidad  
del alma, y veréis que os pesa  
desa loca voluntad.

100

Porque cuando en una aldea  
os retiréis pobremente,  
adonde ninguno os vea,  
se templará el accidente  
que agora el alma desea,  
y el justo arrepentimiento  
os traerá tanto disgusto,  
que no tengáis sufrimiento,  
porque del amor el gusto  
es una cometa al viento.

105

110

Otavio

Antonio, yo no os llamé  
para pedir os consejo  
cuando me determiné,  
ni agora sois vos tan viejo,  
ni sabéis más que yo sé.  
Por mayordomo y privanza  
de la Duquesa, os quería  
dar cuenta de mi esperanza,  
y fue porque no entendía  
que todo el daño os alcanza;  
porque si os han de quitar

115

120



el gobierno desta hacienda,  
bien hacéis de<sup>1</sup>replicar.

Antonio Vueseñoría no entienda  
que interés me ha de obligar 125  
a dejar de ser quien fui:  
no vine a servir aquí  
por interés,fue afición<sup>2</sup>  
que a la casa de Aragón  
tengo desde que nací. 130  
Pobre soy,pero no tanto  
que hacienda de la Duquesa  
me obligue.

Otavio De vos me espanto,  
Señor Antonio,y me pesa  
que mi amor honesto y santo 135  
os parezca mal a vos,  
si en esto no os va interés.

Antonio ¡Interés! ¡Bueno,por Dios!

Otavio ¿Qué se os da a vos que después  
vivamos pobres los dos? 140

Antonio Digo,señor,que os caséis  
una vez y mil.

Otavio Antonio,  
esto es amor,ya lo veis.

Antonio Bien lo dice el testimonio  
del disparate que hacéis. 145

Otavio ¿Vos queréiselo decir?

Antonio Quiero serviros en eso.

Otavio Si le habéis de persuadir  
como a mí...

Antonio Verdad profeso;  
yo os quiero en esto servir. 150  
Id con Dios,que a fe de hidalgo  
de hacer todo buen oficio  
si con la Duquesa valgo.

Otavio Y yo os haré algún servicio  
si con la<sup>3</sup>que emprendo salgo; 155

1.D:en

2.C:no vine por interés a servir aquí/fue afición

3.A,D:lo

en albricias, por lo menos  
una cadena tendréis  
de mil escudos.

Váyase Otavio.

Antonio

Los buenos

mandando obligan. ¿Qué hacéis,  
ojos de lágrimas llenos? 160

¿Por qué no formáis un mar  
en que me pueda anegar?  
Mas nombre ingrato merezco,  
pues la tabla no agradezco  
donde me puedo salvar, 165

que, casada la Duquesa,  
deste amor y vano empleo  
cesará la loca impresa,  
si el efecto del deseo  
cesando la causa, cesa; 170  
o conoceré su intento,  
tratándole el casamiento.

Ánimo, esperanza loca,  
que como vos sois tan poca,  
desmaya el atrevimiento. 175

Váyase.

Salgan la Duquesa de Amalfi, en hábito de viuda,  
y Libia, camarera suya, y Celso, viejo.

Duquesa ¿Qué hace el Duque?

Celso Está en lición.

Duquesa ¿Qué lición?

Celso Como ya escribe,  
también a oír se apercibe  
gramática.

Duquesa Y es razón.

Sepa a lo menos latín, 180  
que en un príncipe está bien.

Celso El lo decora tan bien  
que le verá presto el fin.

El niño más entendido  
es Su Excelencia, señora, 185  
que Italia conoce agora.

Duquesa Dice al padre que ha tenido.  
Id, y diréis al maestro  
que él de las armas no falte.



Celso Es de las letras esmalto,  
 ser un caballero diestro.  
 A fe, que si me cogiera  
 algunos años atrás,  
 que yo lo enseñara más  
 que Rodamonte pudiera.

190

Duquesa ¿Fuistes diestro?

195

Celso ¿Pues había  
 en toda Italia mi igual?<sup>1</sup>  
 Ya es más diestro, por mi mal,  
 este bordón, pues me guía.

Duquesa Id a lo que os digo.

Celso Voy.

200

Duquesa ¡Ah, Libia, en cuánto cuidado  
 me ha puesto amor!

Libia No me ha dado  
 menos, aunque libre estoy;  
 que el ver tu desasosiego  
 en cosa tan desigual,  
 si a ti te tiene mortal,  
 a mí me deshace en fuego.  
 Conozco en la libertad  
 con que te quieres porder,  
 que es gran mal en la mujer  
 enviudar en mocedad.

205

Duquesa Luego ¿piensas, Libia mía,  
 que por mortal interés,  
 a Dios primero, y después  
 a mi honor, ofensa haría?

215

Libia Pues ¿por qué quieres hablar  
 a Antonio, tu mayordomo?

Duquesa Yo pienso que entiendo cómo.

Libia La vida te ha de costar  
 este indigno casamiento.

220

Duquesa ¿Quiéresle tú?

Libia ¿Yo, señora?

1. A, B, C, primary text: Pues había/on toda Italia mi igual  
 D: Pues no había/on toda Italia mi igual





Libia

Y tú su muerte, en efeto.  
 No sé: toda estoy temblando;  
 ni te aconsejo ni impido;  
 mas si deseas marido,  
 muchos te están deseando,  
 si no de tu calidad,  
 poco menos.

260

Duquesa

Ya he pensado  
 que casar con mi criado  
 desdice mi autoridad.  
 Mas fíome en el secreto;  
 porque el casarnos los dos  
 es justo temor de Dios,  
 más que de mi honor respeto.  
 No se sabrá si se fía  
 de ti y de él.

265

Libia

Quiéralo el cielo.

Sale Antonio.

Antonio

Amor, con alas de hielo,  
 lleva la esperanza mía,  
 cual mariposa a la llama,  
 al sol de unos ojos bellos;  
 que quien se iguala con ellos  
 imita a Luzbel la fama.  
 Voy donde me he<sup>1</sup> de abrasar;  
 mas quiere naturaleza  
 que me esfuerce su belleza  
 para atreverme a llegar.  
 El sátiro que vio el fuego,  
 con las manos le tomó;  
 pero como le abrasó,<sup>2</sup>  
 arrojóle dellas luego.  
 ¡Ay! ¿Quién luego que llegase  
 al fuego de tanto amor,  
 con la pena del dolor,  
 de las manos le arrojase!  
 ¿La Duquesa estaba aquí?

275

280

285

290

1.C, primary text: ha2.B, le a abrasó

Duquesa ¡Antonio!

Antonio ¡Señora mía!

Hablar a solas querría  
con Vuestra Excelencia.

Duquesa

Ansí,

pues, Libia, aguarda allá fuera;  
despeja la cuadra luego.

Antonio ¡Cielos! Mirándola, ciego.

Libia Tu calidad considera;  
vuelve, señora, por ti.

Vase Libia.

Duquesa Vete, y no repliques más.  
¿De qué tan suspenso estás?

Antonio Señora, de verme aquí.

Duquesa ¿Otras veces no has estado?

Antonio Nunca, señora, he venido  
a lo que agora, que ha sido  
causa de haberme turbado.

Duquesa ¿Turbado, Antonio? ¿Por qué?  
¿Qué tengo yo de aspereza?

Antonio

aparte

Lo que tienes de belleza,  
causa de turbarme fue.

Duquesa Aunque por señora puedo  
causar algo que temer,  
la blandura de mujer,  
¿no basta a quitar el miedo?  
¿Tengo mala condición?  
¿Soy soberbia? ¿Soy muy grave?

Antonio Ya Vuestra Excelencia sabe  
de mi temor la razón.

Si corriendo una cortina  
un ángel se descubriese,  
¿no era<sup>1</sup> justo que temiese  
ver su figura divina?

No todas las cosas graves  
dan temor llegando a ellas;



también le ponen las bellas;  
por mi experiencia lo sabes.

Duquesa ¿Soylo aquí más que otras veces  
que me has visto y me has hablado?

Antonio Habré llegado a tu estrado, 330  
señora, con más jueces.  
Porque ver en soledad  
una hermosura divina,  
luego el pensamiento inclina 335  
a alguna temeridad.  
Porque ¿quién ha de tener  
las alas del pensamiento?  
Que el primero movimiento  
a nadie puede<sup>1</sup> ofender.

Duquesa Ni yo, Antonio, me ofendiera 340  
cuando, como hombre, pensaras  
que soy mujer.

Antonio Bien reparas  
lo que el temor considera.  
A tu gran benignidad,  
a tu heroica discreción, 345  
debe el alma esa razón.

Duquesa Dejemos la autoridad.  
Háblame familiarmente;  
que aunque tu señora soy,  
no siempre en el trono estoy 350  
del título impertinente;  
y aunque es verdad que he tenido  
fama de mujer discreta,  
como esto de ser perfeta  
es raras veces oído, 355  
nunca he querido, en efeto,  
a mi discreción creer;  
que gobierno de mujer,  
¿cómo puede<sup>2</sup> ser discreto?  
Por eso te traje aquí; 360  
y pues me has gobernado  
hijo, casa, hacienda, estado,

1.C: pudo2.B, C, D: pudo

con el valor que hay en ti,  
quiero que de aquí adelante  
me hables de otra manera.  
Cúbrete.

365

Antonio                      Señora, espera;  
dame lugar que me espante,  
dame lugar que a esos pies  
derribe la humildad mía.  
Duquesa                    Háblame con osadía,  
deja agora el ser cortés.  
Cúbrete, Antonio.

370

Antonio                      Señora,  
si tanta merced me hacéis,  
atrevimiento daréis  
a mi pensamiento agora.  
A fe que os he de decir  
lo que denantes callé.

375

Duquesa                    Él me entendió, bien hablé;  
basta mirar, basta oír.  
Si toda el alma me vio,  
acábeme de entender;  
que basta<sup>1</sup> que una mujer,  
y tan noble como yo,  
hable con tantas colores;  
atrévase, pues; ¿qué tarda?  
Que es necio el hombre que aguarda  
a que le digan amores.

380

Antonio                    Sabed, señora, que Otavio  
de Médicis...

Duquesa                    ¡Esto es bueno!

Antonio                    De alegre esperanza lleno  
(no sé si en esto os agravio),  
hoy me ha enviado a llamar,  
y me pidió que os hablase.

390

Duquesa                    ¿Que desto agora tratase?  
Él no me debe de amar.  
Si, como lo he sospechado,  
éste me quisiera bien,  
entendiérame tan bien

395



.  
 cómo yo me he declarado.  
 Pues sin conocer su amor,  
 error será declararme. 400  
 Antonio O no quieres escucharme,  
 o te divierte el honor.  
 Digo, señora, que Otavio  
 adora a Vuestra Excelencia; 405  
 es hombre de la presencia  
 que ha visto, es gallardo, es sabio.  
 Quiere casarse, y no quiere  
 más que sola su persona.  
 Duquesa A Otavio su amor le abona; 410  
 es hombre, su amor refiere;  
 todo hombre tiene licencia  
 de decir a una mujer  
 que la desea.  
 Antonio Ha de ser 415  
 como él a Vuestra Excelencia,  
 que es su igual, y la pretende  
 por mujer.  
 Duquesa Un desigual  
 ofende si quiere mal;  
 que si quiere bien, no ofende.  
 ¿Es mal hecho querer bien? 420  
 Antonio No es mal hecho; mas ¿si llega  
 a deseo, y pide y ruega  
 que de amar premio le den?  
 Duquesa ¿Ante qué juez lo<sup>1</sup> pide? 425  
 ¿Qué testigos falsos llama,  
 si la persona a quien ama  
 es quien la causa decide?  
 Espántasme, Antonio.  
 Antonio ¿Cómo?  
 Duquesa No mires a mi nobleza;  
 habla como mi cabeza 430  
 y no como mayordomo,  
 habla como hombre.

Antonio No puedo.

Duquesa ¿Qué tienes?

Antonio Tiemblo.

Duquesa ¿De qué?

Antonio Del miedo con que llegué  
a quitarte tanto el miedo. 435

Duquesa ¿Mi ánimo te acobarda?

Antonio No, ¡por Dios! Mas dime ahora,  
¿qué diré a Otavio, señora?

Duquesa Oye, y la respuesta aguarda.  
Finge que un camino emprendes 440  
largo, por mar o por tierra,  
y que al salir de tu tierra  
al tiempo que ir solo entiendes,  
se te ofrecen dos que intentan  
hasta el fin acompañarte, 445  
y cada cual por su parte  
a tu lado se presentan.  
Al uno destos dos tienes  
natural inclinación,  
en cuya conversación 450  
te regalas y entretienes.  
Al otro, aborrecimiento  
con tal fuerza de pesar,  
que sólo el oírle hablar  
te causa desabrimiento. 455  
¿Con cuál de aquéstos harías  
el camino a que te ofreces,  
con él que amas, o aborreces?

Antonio ¿De esa respuesta tenías<sup>1</sup>  
alguna duda?

Duquesa Pues di, 460  
¿con cuál de los dos irás?

Antonio Con él que me agrada más.

Duquesa Lo mismo entiende de mí.  
El casarse es un camino  
largo hasta el fin de la vida; 465



la compañía ofrecida,  
 en dos hombres la imagino.  
 Otavio es él que aborrezco.  
 Antonio ¿Puedo él que quieres saber?  
 Duquesa Para tan poco entender, 470  
 muy descubierta me ofrezco.  
 ¿Dónde está tu ingenio, Antonio?  
 Antonio Mi humildad le tiene ciego.  
 Duquesa Con vergüenza a tratar llego 475  
 del segundo matrimonio.  
 Pero espera aquí un papel,  
 sabrás el hombre que quiero;  
 que a ser su amor verdadero,  
 él me entendiera sin él.

Váyase la Duquesa.

Antonio Cobarde pensamiento, nunca el cielo 480  
 logre tus esperanzas,  
 pues cuando el bien alcanzas,  
 te derribas por el suelo.  
 Mas tal castigo lleve  
 él que ama y es amado y no se atreve, 485  
 cuando ocasión alguna  
 le ofrece su fortuna.  
 Si allí no cobra lo que amor le debe,  
 ¿qué esperanza le queda?  
 Merece que jamás cobrarla pueda 490  
 quien suelta los cabellos.  
 ¡Ay, dulces ojos bellos,  
 a mi fortuna detened la rueda!  
 "El bien perdí cobarde,  
 que perdido una vez, se alcanza tarde", 495  
 dirá el papel que espero.  
 Hoy justamente muero:  
 si tuve el bien, ¿qué bien habrá que aguarde,  
 que amor no le concede<sup>1</sup>  
 cuando le deja él que gozarle puede? 500

Sale Libia con un papel.

Libia Este papel me ha mandado  
 mi señora la Duquesa  
 que te diese.

1. B, C: que amor le concede

Antonio                                      A mí me pesa,  
Libia, de haberla enojado  
tratándole casamiento.

Libia            Ahí dice que hallarás  
                     el hombre que quiere más.

Antonio      Yo sólo su gusto intento:  
la casa Médicis era  
muy conforme a su valor.

Sale Urbino, secretario.

Urbino Sin duda le tiene amor;  
papel le dio.Libia,espera.

Libia            ¿Qué quieres?

Urbino                                  No eran en vano  
mis celos. ¿Qué papel diste  
a Antonio?

**Libia**                      ¿Yo?

Tú; y le asiste  
con tiernos ojos la mano.

Libia            Lo del papel es verdad,  
                 lo de los ojos mentira;  
                 siempre con antojos mira,  
                 Urbino, la voluntad.  
                 Aquel papel es memoria  
                 del recado de un vestido.

Vase Libia.

Adi6s.

Antonio                    ¡Desdichado he sido  
al principio de mi historia!  
¿Si me vio dar el papel?

Urbino            Pues, ¿Antonio?

Antonio                                Oh, secretario!

Urbino            Si ese nombre es necesario  
                      para un amigo fíel,  
                      aquí le tenéis en mí.  
                      Huélgome que Libia os ame.

Antonio      ¿En qué lo veis?

Urbino                      En que os llame  
su dueño.

Antonio                      ¿A mí? ¿Cómo así?

505

510

515

520

525

530



Urbino           Negad que un papel os dio.

Antonio          Decir quiero que es verdad;  
tengo a Libia voluntad. 535

Urbino          ¿Sabéis que la sirvo yo?

Antonio          Agora lo sé de vos;  
desde hoy más, por vuestra queda.

Urbino          Cuando acetarla os conceda  
por la amistad de los dos, 540  
ha de ser como no entienda  
que os cuesta pena el dejalla,  
y que el discurso de amalla<sup>1</sup>  
no tiene prenda que prenda.  
¿Tenéis más de ese papel? 545

Antonio          Sólo este papel me ha dado.

Urbino          Si mi amor os ha obligado,  
dadme, Antonio, parte dél;  
veámosle aquí los dos,  
por vida de la Duquesa. 550

Antonio          De que me tratéis me pesa  
con tal sospecha, ¡por Dios!  
Basta que palabra he dado;  
que no la hablaré creed. 555

Urbino          Pues hacedme una merced  
de que le rasguéis cerrado.

Antonio          El rasgar de mi memoria  
a Libia, haré yo por vos,  
y basta que de los dos  
cese al principio la historia, 560  
sin pedir cosas que son  
contra mi buen proceder;  
que no es bien que una mujer  
me tenga en baja opinión. 565

Urbino          La grande amistad, Antonio,  
que hemos tenido los dos,  
de que sospecho que vos  
tenéis cierto testimonio,<sup>2</sup>

1. B, C: hablalla2. A, B: cierto el testimonio

a peditos me obligó  
 todo lo que habéis oído;  
 mas, pues me habéis respondido  
 a lo del papel que no,  
 acabóse la<sup>1</sup> amistad;  
 desobligado me habéis.

570

Antonio

Oíd, si os vais.

Urbino

¿Qué queréis?

575

Antonio

Si quedo en mi libertad  
 y hemos de ser enemigos,  
 A Libia vuelvo a querer.

Urbino

Como eso podéis hacer,  
 Antonio, en no siendo amigos,  
 queredla, que yo también  
 algún día os daré enojos  
 en las niñas de los ojos.

580

Antonio

Oíd y tratadme bien;  
 que si no os he respondido,  
 es porque he considerado  
 que de un amigo enojado  
 triunfa mucho el ofendido;  
 y porque veáis que soy  
 tan hidalgo y liberal,  
 que en vez de responder mal,  
 gusto por enojo os doy,  
 ¿Es éste el papel?

585

Urbino

Él es.

Antonio

Pues quito el sello.

Urbino

¿A qué efeto?

Antonio

Para verle; y os prometo  
 que le habéis de ver después.

595

Sácale con la mano aquel pedacito<sup>2</sup> en que está escrito  
su nombre.

Mirad que poco le miro.

Tomad.

1. B, C: el2. B, C: pedazo



Urbino ¿Qué es lo que quitáis?

Antonio Siete letras.

Urbino ¿Qué me dais?

Antonio El papel.

Urbino Mucho me admiro  
de que tan seguro estéis  
del secreto: en blanco está.

Antonio Probad a entendello allá,  
pues tantas cifras sabéis,  
porque me destruya el cielo  
si ninguna tiene en sí.

Urbino Pues ¿qué guardastes ahí  
para aumentar mi recelo?

Antonio Siete letras.

Urbino ¿No traía  
otra cosa?

Antonio No, ¡por Dios!

Urbino Si vive un alma en los dos  
y partí con vos la mía,  
dadme las letras primeras  
de esas siete.

Antonio Quiero daros,  
para más desengañaros,  
dos letras de las postreras.  
Tomad aquésta.

Urbino Ésta es o.

Antonio Ésta es i.

Urbino Quien dos me da,  
las cinco también dará.

Antonio ¿Cómo las cinco? Eso no.  
¿Soy yo reloj, por ventura?  
Llevad, Urbino, esas dos.

Urbino Dadme las demás, ¡por Dios!  
si mi amor os asegura.

Antonio Si la mayor amistad  
es de las cosas partir  
la mitad, basta pedir  
destas letras la mitad.  
Las tres os tocan; partamos  
la una.

Urbino Dádmela entera,  
¡por Dios!

600

605

610

615

620

625

630

Antonio

Por cosa ligera

no es bien que los dos riñamos;  
 dos tenéis,veis aquí dos;  
 a la o sigue la i.

Urbino

¿Esto no es un n?

Antonio

Es así.

Urbino

¿Van por órden?

Antonio

¡Sí, por Dios!

Urbino

Pues ésta es o.

Antonio

Ya tenéis

cuatro letras, las postreras.

Urbino

¡Ay, si las otras me dieras!

Antonio

De la razón excedéis.

Aparte

¡Cielos! ¡Antonio decía  
 en su papel la Duquesa,  
 dando a entender que esta empresa  
 es de Antonio, y ella es mía!  
 Las cuatro letras le dí,  
 que no sabrá concertar,  
 por excusar de criar  
 enemigos contra mí.  
 Sólo traía el papel  
 este nombre en que reparo;  
 que soy su dueño está claro,  
 mi nombre lo dice en él.  
 Bien sé que ha de costar<sup>1</sup>  
 la vida, si a sus hermanos  
 llegan sus intentos vanos;  
 mas ¿dónde podrá emplear  
 un hombre tan bien la vida?  
 Adiós, Urbino.

Urbino

Él os guarde.

Váyase Antonio.

Éste sospecha que tarde  
 será su letra entendida,  
 y mientras secreto habló,  
 las cuatro letras junté:

1. A, D: que me ha de costar



o,i,n,o,bien sé  
 que quieren decir oi no.  
 Que hoy no le podrá gozar,  
 sin duda quiso decir;  
 mas ¿por qué le ha de escribir  
 hoy no,si hoy la pudo hablar?  
 Las letras dan testimonio,  
 que si a él le quedan tres,  
 y el oi no vuelvo al revés,  
 es fin del nombre de Antonio.  
 Porque las tres que le quedan,  
 sin duda son a,n y t;  
 luego Antonio el nombre fue,  
 pues ¿qué es lo que éstos enredan?  
Antonio sólo traía  
 en un papel;ahora bien,  
 si las letras no se ven,  
 y es alguna tropelía,  
 yo le pondré al<sup>1</sup> agua,al fuego,  
 o<sup>2</sup> con humo le daré,  
 que agua,y fuego y humo<sup>3</sup> haré  
 de mi loco intento ciego.  
 Agua mis ojos darán,  
 fuego el pecho,y la esperanza  
 humo;mas esta mudanza  
 los dos me la pagarán.  
 Yo seguiré de manera  
 a Antonio,pues fue traidor  
 a nuestra amistad su amor,  
 que en este amor persevera;  
 yo diré dél tanto mal  
 a la Duquesa,aunque sea  
 mentira,que presto vea  
 que fue a mi amor desleal;  
 yo le echaré de su casa,  
 yo le pondré mal con ella.

665

670

675

680

685

690

695

1.C,D:el2.D:y3.C:que aguas,fuegos y humo

Sale la Duquesa.

Duquesa	Ya la primera centella a incendio del alma pasa, y va creciendo de suerte, con haberme declarado, que ya me han notificado mis desventuras la muerte. Pero, como yo me case y no padezca mi honor, ¿qué muerte por tanto amor no será justo que pase? Urbino está aquí: ¿qué quieres, secretario?	700            705
Urbino	¿Ha respondido Vuestra Excelencia?	710
Duquesa	He tenido, Urbino, mil pareceres en razón deste concierto: es muy niño el Duque agora.	
Urbino	Tu hermano intenta, señora, tu bien.	715
Duquesa	Créolo, por cierto.	
Urbino	¿Y del Duque, su sobrino?	
Duquesa	Yo responderé a mi hermano.	
Urbino	Con Vuestra Excelencia en vano se trata, a lo que imagino, negocio de casamiento. ¿Tanto aborrece el casarse?	720
Duquesa	De mí no puede tratarse, no tengo tal pensamiento; de mi hijo no es razón, pues no ha llegado a la edad que nos muestre voluntad, ni a Ferrara inclinación; y segunda, no la quiero en instrumento tan mío.	725
Urbino	Que has de ver presto confío un casamiento que espero, dentro de tu misma casa.	730



Duquesa ¡Válame Dios!

Urbino No te alteres.

Duquesa ¿Alguna de mis mujeres  
sin mi voluntad se casa?

Urbino Juzgando yo sin malicia  
entre personas de honor,  
pienso que para el amor  
en casarse.

Duquesa Eso es justicia;  
pero ¿quién le tiene a quién?

Urbino Libia a Antonio, y él a ella.

Duquesa ¿Sábeslo dél?

Urbino Dé! y della,  
y de mis ojos también;  
mas mire Vuestra Excelencia  
que me ha de guardar secreto.

Duquesa Secreto, Urbino, prometo.

Aparte.

Mas no prometo paciencia.  
¿Qué has visto?

Urbino Darle un papel  
Libia a Antonio.

Duquesa ¿Cuándo?

Urbino Agora.

Duquesa Véte, Urbino.

Urbino Pues, señora,  
¿no tengo de ser fiel  
al oficio, al pan que como  
tantos años en tu casa?

Duquesa Ya sé lo que en esto pasa,  
no es culpado el mayordomo.

Urbino ¿No es culpado?

Duquesa No.

Urbino Esas alas  
que le da Vuestra Excelencia...

Duquesa Salte allá, poca prudencia.  
Cuando de cosas tan malas  
se me ha de dar cuenta a mí,  
ha de haber información  
muy cierta.

735

740

745

750

755

760

Urbino

Con ocasión

te he contado lo que vi,  
pensando que era en tu ofensa,  
porque las cosas de amor,  
al principio del rigor  
tienen más fácil defensa;  
que Antonio es mi grande amigo,  
pero si a ti te ofendiera,  
de mi padre te dijera  
lo que de Antonio te digo.

765

770

Sale Antonio.

Antonio

La carroza, dice Estacio  
que has mandado prevenir.

775

Duquesa

Fuera quisiera salir  
esta tarde de palacio;  
no sé si ha de haber lugar.  
Secretario, oíd.

Urbino

Señora...

Duquesa

A mis hermanos agora  
no quisiera disgustar.  
Escribid que no estoy buena,  
y por eso no escribo,  
mientras remedio apercibo  
para excusarme esta pena.  
Esto será necesario;  
y no digáis mal de quien  
me dice de vos más bien  
que merecéis, secretario.

780

785

Urbino

Voy a escribir lo que mandas.

Duquesa

Dilata este matrimonio.  
Antonio.

790

Antonio

Señora...

Duquesa

Antonio,  
muy necio en mis cosas andas.  
¿Cómo el secretario vio  
darte el papel?

Antonio

Libia tiene  
la culpa.

Duquesa

Lo que conviene  
a mi honor, que yo soy yo,<sup>1</sup>

795

1. B, C: que soy yo



no se mira como es justo.

Antonio

Aparte.

Bien dicen que en la mujer,  
aborrecer y querer  
es tornasol de su gusto.

800

A ella.

De otra manera creí  
que aquel nombre señalabas,  
pues en el papel mostrabas  
más de lo que cupo en mí.  
El papel, señora, hiciste  
del corazón; con razón  
fue mi nombre el corazón,  
pues en medio le escribiste.

805

Con siete letras escribes  
una mano de papel,  
porque la que viene en él,  
para dármela apercibes.

810

Mas fue vano mi placer,  
y mi crédito más vano;  
que fue de papel la mano,  
y la firma de mujer.

815

¡Ay, Dios! Si el amor supiera,  
pues andaba entonces franco,  
tu nombre, porque en lo blanco  
la obligación escribiera!

820

Burla fue poner el mío;  
pues, por luto de mi muerte,  
en blanco muestra mi suerte,  
y en negro mi desvarío.

825

¿Desto sólo te ofendiste?

Duquesa

De suerte que te aborrezco;  
pues cuando mi honor te ofrezco,  
adonde ves le pusiste.

Antonio

¿Que mi humildad la presunción dilate?  
¿Que finja el alma que tu amor ignora  
te ha podido ofender, dulce señora,  
por no rendirte en el primer combate?

830

¡Plega al cielo, Camila, que me mate  
 el primer hombre con quien hable ahora,  
 o que antes que otro sol traiga el aurora,  
 te goce Otavio, comuniqué y trate!  
 Que porque veas si me abrasa y arde  
 el no asir la ocasión por los cabellos,  
 yo iré donde mi nombre escuchas tarde,  
 o por dicha seré Absalón sin ellos;  
 que no seré para morir cobarde  
 estando ausente de tus ojos bellos.

835

840

Duquesa

Detente.

Antonio

¿Por qué razón  
 me tiene Vuestra Excelencia?

Duquesa

Antonio, con más paciencia.

845

Antonio

¿Paciencia en esta ocasión?

¡Mataréme!

Duquesa

Aun por ahí  
 sospecharé que me quieres:  
 Antonio, a nobles mujeres  
 nunca las trates así.  
 ¿Qué aguardabas, si me vías  
 perdida, que te dijese?  
 ¿No era<sup>1</sup> razón que entendiese  
 que algún amor me tenías?  
 Si a la ocasión pintan calva,  
 mucho tu ingenio condeno:  
 ¿eran mis brazos veneno,  
 que a Otavio pides la salva?  
 ¿Querías, contra mi fama,  
 que te pusiese, muy loca,  
 los favores en la boca,  
 y que tú fueses la dama?  
 Habla, dime que me quieres,  
 di que te mueres. ¿Qué lloras?  
 Porque también las señoras  
 sentimos como mujeres.  
 Atrévete; sepa yo  
 que me quieres; dime amores;

850

855

860

865



el título de señores  
el cielo a los hombres dio.

870

La de mayor calidad  
no es señora, ni lo espere,  
pues no hará lo que quisiere,  
ni ha de tener libertad.

¡Oh, falta de hombres discretos  
ser turbados y encogidos!

875

Antonio

Son los necios atrevidos,  
que son de su causa efetos.

Si conocer mi humildad,  
señora, te ha dado enojos;  
si el respeto de mis ojos  
al sol de tu calidad;

880

si el no me haber atrevido,  
puesto que ocasión me has dado;  
si el no me haber declarado

885

que tu amor he conocido,  
vesme aquí que llego a ti,  
aunque altar de mi respeto,  
porque atrevido un discreto  
te muestre que yo lo fui.

890

Tu blanca mano asiré,  
osaré abrazarte, y creo  
que haré abeja mi deseo,  
y flor de tu boca haré.

Duquesa

Tente.

Antonio

¿No me das licencia?

895

Duquesa

¿Tal cosa osaste decir?

Antonio

Pues vuélvome a descubrir:  
perdone Vuestra Excelencia.

Duquesa

Ahora bien, esto es andar  
dando vueltas a la vela;  
para el amor no hay cautela  
ni fuerzas para callar.

900

Antonio, yo te adoro; pero advierte  
que ha de ser de otra suerte el adorarte.  
No has de tocarme en parte de que sienta  
mi honor alguna afrenta; con secreto  
podrás, si eres discreto, ser mi dueño.  
Esta prenda te empeño, que es mi honra:  
por excusar deshonor, y por la ofensa

905

de Dios, que ha de ser, piensa, amado Antonio, 910  
en justo matrimonio mi deseo.

Si lo entendiesen, creo que mi vida  
y la tuya, perdida, fuese a manos  
de aquellos dos hermanos generosos,  
cuyos hechos famosos, Francia, España, 915  
y cuanto cerca y baña el mar, celebran.  
Cuanto amor quiebran y se pierden  
de la causa se acuerden, que es saberse.  
Cuando venga a ofrecerse el ser forzoso,  
dirás que eres mi esposo, y entretanto 920  
que quiere el cielo tanto<sup>1</sup> favor darme,  
gozarte yo y gozarme con secreto,  
será dichoso efeto de mi gusto.

Antonio Fuera de que es tan justo, gran señora,  
ya que me pone agora mi fortuna 925  
sobre la hermosa luna de tu cielo,  
el secreto y recelo del bien mío,  
en mi dicha confío que no entienda  
ninguno que soy prenda de tu pecho.  
Hoy me has formado y hecho. ¡Quién pudiera, 930  
sino quien cielo fuera, y que hoy me ampara,  
hacer que te igualara! ¿Yo tu esposo?

Duquesa Antonio venturoso, hoy atropella  
mi autoridad tu estrella; yo soy tuya;  
mas porque se concluya nuestro intento, 935  
no hallo al casamiento modo alguno.

Antonio Si el rumor importuno de la fama  
sospechas que te infama, dulce prenda,  
yo tengo allá, en mi hacienda, labradores  
rudos, toscos pastores de ganados. 940  
Podemos, disfrazados, ir a vellos,  
y mezclados con ellos, por ventura,  
hacer que el mismo cura de su aldea,  
que puesto que nos vea importa poco,  
nos case, y vuelva loco mi sentido 945  
de ver que he merecido tu grandeza.

Duquesa ¡Extraña sutileza! Pues salgamos  
esta noche, y vistamos tosco traje:



yo, en hábito de paje, iré contigo,  
hasta llegar, amigo, al dulce puesto 950  
donde, con lazo honesto de casados,  
sin ser jamás culpados, nos gocemos.

Antonio Y en casa, ¿qué diremos de tu ausencia?

Duquesa Libia, con advertencia, echará fama  
que estoy mala en la cama.

Antonio ¡Gran remedio! 955  
Cuando la noche, en medio de los polos,  
con sus luceros solos mire el mundo,  
y con sueño profundo esté quieto,  
saldremos con secreto en dos caballos.

Duquesa Pues parte a aderezallos.

Antonio Los vestidos 960  
estarán prevenidos.

Duquesa Amor quiera  
que llegue a la ribera deste río.  
¡Adiós, dulce bien mío!

Antonio ¡Adiós mi cielo!

Duquesa Ven con grande recelo de mi gente.

Antonio Sólo estará presente amor, que guía 965  
mi esperanza, luz mía, al rayo de oro.

Duquesa ¡Ay Antonio, que adoro esos pies tuyos!

Antonio Detenga en mí los suyos la fortuna.

Duquesa Por ti no hay muerte alguna.

Antonio Por ti es vida  
la muerte.

Duquesa ¡Ay, mi querida prenda amada! 970

Antonio Esposa regalada, adiós te queda.

Duquesa Sólo le pido que gozarte pueda.

Váyanse Antonio y la Duquesa.  
Salgan Melampo y Arsindo, labradores viejos,  
y Doristo, mozo.

Melampo ¡No os pongáis delante, Arsindo,  
que he de matar al traidor!

Arsindo Llevadle con más amor. 975

Doristo ¿A mí matarme? ¡Oh, qué lindo!

Tenéos, abuelo.

Melampo El cielo  
te ha de dar justo castigo.

Doristo Tenéos, abuelo, digo;  
digo que os tengáis, abuelo. 980

Melampo ¿Ese respeto me tienes?

Doristo ¿Qué respeto he de tener?

Melampo ¡Oh, que presto que has de ver  
el engaño con que vienes!

Arsindo ¿No sabremos la quistión? 985

Doristo Porque me quiero casar.

Melampo Sí; ya quiere gallear  
sin salir del cascarón.  
Cuando a su madre casé,  
sus cuarenta años tenía. 990

Doristo Si ella os<sup>1</sup> oyera, a fe mía  
que os desmintiera.

Melampo ¿Por qué?  
Fue aquesto en reinos extraños?  
¿Desmentirme quieres?

Doristo Porque todas las mujeres  
se casan de catorce años.  
Si ha quince que conoció  
marido, y tiene cuarenta,  
veréis que confiesa treinta  
porque de quince pasó. 995  
Si una hija está presente  
y en edad para casar,  
las cinco le ha de quitar  
aunque sólo tenga veinte.  
Quince y quince, digo yo  
que serán treinta. 1000

Arsindo Es ansí.

Doristo Pues no he de pasar de allí.  
Porque de quince casó  
mi madre, también dijera  
que era yo de quince agora... 1010

Melampo Calla, Doristo, en mal hora.

Doristo Y ella de su treinta fuera.  
Y aunque con locos engaños  
negar la edad se porfía,  
cierto discreto decía 1015



que a ser pecados los años,  
aunque se ven<sup>1</sup> en la cara  
y es disparate negallos,  
sólo por no confesallos,  
ninguno se confesara.

1020

Ya no es tiempo, abuelo mío,  
de andar en antigüedades;  
sabed que en estas edades  
es muy diferente el brío.  
Si en la vuestra se casaban  
de treinta años, o cuarenta,  
ya es diferente la cuenta,  
o es que las cosas se acaban.

1025

Aun no tiene sentimiento  
en el pecho de su madre  
la niña, y dice a su padre:  
"Taita, taita, casamiento".

1030

Apenas en un quillotro  
la comienzan a envolver,  
cuando dice que es mujer  
para casarse con otro.  
Yo soy hombre ya barbado  
y si me quiero casar,  
no es sin causa.

1035

Melampo                      Ésa has de dar.

Doristo      ¿Qué más que andar amurado?<sup>2</sup>

**Melampo**            ¿No tienes vergüenza?

Doristo	No.
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
35	35
36	36
37	37
38	38
39	39
40	40
41	41
42	42
43	43
44	44
45	45
46	46
47	47
48	48
49	49
50	50
51	51
52	52
53	53
54	54
55	55
56	56
57	57
58	58
59	59
60	60
61	61
62	62
63	63
64	64
65	65
66	66
67	67
68	68
69	69
70	70
71	71
72	72
73	73
74	74
75	75
76	76
77	77
78	78
79	79
80	80
81	81
82	82
83	83
84	84
85	85
86	86
87	87
88	88
89	89
90	90
91	91
92	92
93	93
94	94
95	95
96	96
97	97
98	98
99	99
100	100

Arsindo        ¿Es mal hecho querer bien  
para casarse?

**Doristo** **También**

mi padre se enamoró.

¡Par Dios, Arsindo, si el cielo  
lo tiene determinado,  
que hoy me habéis de ver casado,  
aunque le pese a mi abuelo!

1045

Arsindo      Melampo, no seáis extraño;  
el mozo tiene voluntad  
de casarse.

1050

1. A:ve

2.B:a murado

Melampo                      ¿Hay tal maldad?

Arsindo      ¿Resulta desto algún daño?

Melampo            Fuera de que en el gobierno

de su casa andará faltar,

me da mayor sobresalto

verle mochacho tan tierno,

que ha de caer en afrenta

con la novia. Habradle vos.

Arsindo            Mira, Doristo, ¡por Dios!

que tu bien tu abuelo intenta;

él te quisiera casar.

pero eres rapaz agora.

y teme, aflígese y llora,

que en falta nos has de echar.

**Doristo            ¿Cómo en falta?**

Arsindo    En nò ser hombre

que agrades la desposada.

Doristo      ¿Eso teme?

Arsindo                      Eso le enfada.

Doristo      Pues para que no se asombre.

aunque vuestra hija sea.

¡par Dios que lo he de decir!

Arsindo      Deseo, como al vivir.

que en paz Melampo se vea.<sup>1</sup>

**Doristo            En bien o mal gobernada**

la casa, no me entremeto:

cuanto a la novia, os prometo...

Arsindo                      Dilo.

Doristo                      Que está ya preñada.

Arsindo                    ¿Preñada?

Doristo                      Pues, ¿qué queréis

si no fue más en mi mano?

Arsindo                    ¿Cómo no?

Melampo                      Que es cuento vano:

miente porque le caséis.

Doristo      ¿Cómo miente? Pues si vos

estuviéradés ansí,

vinieran de Roma aquf.

abuelo, a veros, ¡por Dios!

1.D:que en paz,Melampo,se vea



1085

Arsindo Melampo, estas burlas son  
muy pesadas; si Bartola  
es mi hija única y sola,  
¿es buena aquesta traición?

Melampo Hijo, dime si es verdad.

Doristo Abuelo, yo no lo sé:  
una noche la encontré  
camino de la ciudad;  
rempujéla en un rastrojo,  
no adrede, mas por reír,  
y diz que quiere parir,  
si no lo habéis por enojo.

1090

Melampo ¿Parir? ¡Mataréle! ¡Afuera!

Doristo El dimuño os sufrirá.  
Si no me casaban ya  
porque en falta no cayera,  
cuando han sabido<sup>1</sup> la sobra,  
¿De qué sirve este castigo?

1095

Arsindo Melampo, si sois mi amigo,  
mirad que el honor se cobra  
de cualquier suerte que sea.

1105

Melampo Baste<sup>2</sup>; no es la culpa mía;  
decid que a la casería  
venga el cura de la<sup>3</sup> aldea.

Salen Antonio y la Duquesa en hábito de labradores.

Arsindo Voyle a llamar.

Antonio Aquí están,

Vase Arsindo.

señora, dos labradores,  
y en no ser de mis pastores,  
mayor ánimo me dan.

1110

Duquesa ¿Vamos bien para la<sup>4</sup> aldea?

Melampo Ese buen hombre va allá.

Doristo A llamar al cura va.

1115

1. A, C, D: subido

2. B: basta

3. A: del

4. A: el

Antonio Si es por bien, para bien sea;  
si es por mal, pésame.

Melampo Es bien.

Antonio Pues del bien, parabién doy;  
y si viene, cierto estoy  
que a mí también me le den.  
¿Cuándo vendrá?

1120

Melampo De aquí a un hora.

Antonio Gran sutileza he pensado.

Duquesa ¿Cómo?

Antonio El cura que han<sup>1</sup> llamado  
pasará este monte ahora;  
yo me tenderé en el suelo,  
dirás que muriendo estoy  
de una herida, y que no soy  
tu esposo, y tengo recelo  
de perder mi salvación:  
que nos case en aquel punto,  
porque si quedo difunto,  
Dios me conceda perdón.  
Viendo la necesidad,  
y el peligro que tenemos,  
nos casará, y volveremos  
casados a la ciudad.

1125

1130

Duquesa Linda industria entra en el monte.

Antonio Yo me echaré en el camino.

Váyanse.

Doristo ¿Quién será, abuelo, el padrino?

Melampo Tu vestido nuevo ponte;  
que tu tío lo será.

1140

Doristo Pues irle a llamar querría;  
que es lejos la casería  
y no sé si en ella está;  
que su amo, el mayordomo  
de la Señora Duquesa,  
le<sup>2</sup> llamaba ayer de priesa.

1145

Melampo Pues parte.

Doristo El camino tomo.

1. B: ha

2. B, C, D: la



Melampo        ¡Plega a Dios que en ella esté  
                 y que venga con tu tía!

1150

Doristo        Perdonad, Bartola mía,  
                 si dije que os empreñé!

Abrace/n7

1.C:aliñé

## ACTO SEGUNDO

Salen Otavio de Médicis y criados, y Urbino,  
secretario.

Otavio	¿Dijistes a la Duquesa que eran cartas de su hermano?	
Urbino	Todo amor agora cesa; reina aqueste humor tirano.	
Otavio	De su enfermedad me pesa. Dos años forzosamente he estado en Roma,y ausente, tanto más mi amor creció, que parece que dobló la fuerza del accidente. Acabé el pleito del Conde; traté con Julio Aragón mi casamiento,y responde que estima mi pretensión si ella a quien soy corresponde; pero que sabe su intento, que es huir del casamiento; mas,sabiendo mi afición, me dio cartas en razón de mover su pensamiento. Éstas traigo,y no quisiera darlas sin verla.	5      10          15          20
Urbino	Ha dos meses que vive desta manera.	
Otavio	Querría que le dijeses, si este mi amor considera, si mi sangre,mi valor; mas quien,aunque me desangre, <sup>1</sup> jamás ablanda el rigor, no se moverá por sangre; que no hay sangre como amor. ¿Trátame,Urbino,lealtad? ¿Es por no hablarme,por dicha, fingir esta enfermedad? ¿Ha cerrado mi desdicha las puertas de su piedad?	25          30          35

1.D:aunque medie sangre



.  
¿Dos meses dices<sup>1</sup> que ha estado  
en la cama? Mira bien  
si por saber que he llegado  
y que la adoro también,  
ha de improviso enfermado. 40  
Dime todo lo que pasa:  
¿si por haber yo venido  
este accidente la abrasa?  
Que un amor aborrecido  
puede dar peste a una casa. 45  
¿Mandóte que me dijese  
que estaba enferma?

Urbino                                La fama  
me espanto que no supieses;  
es, sin duda, que en la cama  
ha estado enferma dos meses. 50  
Hoy no la podrás hablar;  
las cartas me puedes dar;  
que si mañana se alivia,  
haré que le diga Libia  
que te dé, Otavio, lugar. 55

Otavio  
¡Que habiendo salud tenido  
dos años que he estado ausente,  
ahora la haya perdido!

Urbino  
No, que este mismo accidente  
otra vez ha padecido. 60  
Estuvo el año pasado,  
por aqueste tiempo, así.

Otavio  
¿Que otra vez enferma ha estado  
después que a Roma partí?

Urbino  
Casi a la muerte ha llegado; 65  
todas son melancolías.

Otavio  
Es moza y está viuda.  
¿Privas con ella?

Urbino                                Estos días,  
de dejarla estuve en duda  
sobre ciertas cosas mías. 70  
No sólo soy su privado,  
pero' apenas, de olvidado,  
papel en la mano tomo.

Antonio, su mayordomo,  
 es el señor de su estado: 75  
 por él se vive, él ordena,  
 él quita, él pone, él da leyes.  
 Otavio ¿Buena persona?  
 Urbino Muy buena.  
 Otavio Sirvió en Nápoles los reyes  
 de Francia.  
 Urbino Nadie condena 80  
 su privanza; mas yo siento  
 que me sirva cierta dama  
 y que trate casamiento.  
 Otavio ¿Es Libia?  
 Urbino Libia se llama;  
 mas no alivia mi tormento. 85  
Sale Antonio.  
 Antonio Mi señora, la Duquesa,  
 a quien en extremo pesa  
 de no poderos hablar  
 que el mal no le da lugar,  
 ni sólo un momento cesa, 90  
 dice que os avisará,  
 Señor Otavio, tan presto,  
 si el cielo alivio le da,  
 cuanto con hábito honesto  
 os pueda hablar.  
 Otavio Bien está; 95  
 que por la desdicha mía,  
 presumí que lo fingía;  
 mas, sabiendo que es verdad,  
 que siento su enfermedad  
 diréis a su Señoría, 100  
 y que licencia me dé  
 sólo para regalalla  
 mientras en Amalfi esté;  
 y que vendré a visitalla  
 cuando me reciba en pie; 105  
 que imagino que ha guardado  
 tanto decoro a su estado,  
 que en la cama no querrá.



Antonio Sabéis su término ya:  
 en castidad ha igualado 110  
 a Zenobia y a Etelfrida.

Otavio Pues, caballeros, adiós.

Váyase Otavio.

Antonio Él te guarde.

Urbino Si a mi vida  
 fue el amistad de los dos  
 siempre, Antonio, preferida, 115  
 oye, pues Otavio es ido,  
 cuán justa queja he tenido  
 de tu proceder extraño.

Antonio Amor es un cierto engaño,  
 sueño del loco sentido. 120

¿No has visto en el azul velo  
 del aire que cubre el cielo,  
 nubes a quien damos nombres  
 ya de sierpes, naves, hombres,  
 ya de animales del suelo? 125

Pues tal la imaginación  
 de un amante pinta en sí  
 la sospecha, la traición;  
 pero deshácense allí,  
 que, en efecto, nubes son. 130

Las de los ojos te quita,  
 y mira que no te ofendo.

Urbino Siempre al crocodilo imita  
 tu llanto; siempre fingiendo,  
 mi muerte y fin solicita. 135

Atrevíme, aunque me pesa  
 de mi loco atrevimiento,  
 a pedir a la Duquesa  
 que me diese en casamiento  
 a Libia, mi antigua<sup>1</sup> empresa, 140  
 y respondiome que a ti  
 la tenía prometida.

Pues si esto, Antonio, es así,  
 ¿no ha sido amistad fingida  
 negarme tu intento a mí? 145

¿Es esto lo prometido  
tantas veces?

Antonio

Yo no he dado  
ocasión, ni la he pedido.  
Su Excelencia habrá pensado  
que por haberla servido,  
con Libia me he<sup>1</sup> de pagar;  
si no tengo a Libia amor,  
¿por qué me quiere casar?  
Si piensa hacerme favor,  
¡por Dios que me hace pesar!  
Está cierto que en mi vida  
le daré a Libia la mano.

150

Urbino

Ella está de ti ofendida.

Antonio

Pues también se queja en vano  
si no es de mí pretendida;  
y si de pensar le pesa  
que se ha de casar conmigo,  
quéjese de la Duquesa.

160

## Urbino

Según eso, Antonio amigo,  
¿bien podré seguir mi empresa?

165

Antonio

**Podrás seguro.**

# Urbino

Pues voy  
a lo que entienda de mí.

Antonio

Urbino, tu amigo soy.  
¿Qué me detengo? ¡Ay de mí!  
Que en tanto peligro estoy.  
Dos años ha que, casado  
con la Duquesa en secreto,  
vivo en tan dichoso estado,  
tan seguro, tan quieto,  
que puedo ser envidiado  
de cuantos hoy tiene el mundo.  
Diome un hijo, que se cría  
con secreto tan profundo,  
que sólo a un monte se fía,  
en quien mi esperanza fundo.  
Y agora este mal fingido,  
es que una hija ha parido

170

175

180



tan bella, si amor no engaña,  
 que podrán Troya y España  
 haberse otra vez perdido. 185  
 Tal es, sin duda ninguna,  
 que los hijos de Latona  
 no harán ventaja ninguna;  
 la misma luz los corona:  
 uno es sol y el otro es luna. 190  
 ¡Oh, qué hijos, santo cielo!  
 ¡Oh, qué gloria! ¡Oh, qué regalo!  
 Ven noche, escurece el suelo;  
 mas si a la luna la igualo,  
 antes detendrás tu velo. 195  
 Pues tu luna habrá de ser,  
 que la tengo de sacar;  
 mas no tienes que temer  
 que no te podrá<sup>1</sup> alumbrar.  
 Si la tengo de envolver 200  
 con mi capa, he de cubrir  
 su resplandor: noche ven,  
 que a un monte habemos de ir.  
 ¡Ay, luna, escóndete bien,  
 pues otra quiere salir! 205  
 Tú, sol, de salir no trates,  
 que otro sol tengo mejor;  
 mas perdona y no me mates,  
 que soy padre, y con amor  
 puedo decir disparates. 210

Váyase.

Salga de noche Urbino.

Urbino      Con los celos que me ha dado  
 la intención de la Duquesa,  
 puesto que a Antonio le pesa,  
 o muestra que le ha pesado,  
 vengo con la obscuridad 215  
 de la noche, sólo a ver  
 si lo que me dijo ayer  
 nace de su voluntad.  
 Hoy se disculpó conmigo:

celos incrédulos son,  
y una amorosa afición  
vende al más seguro amigo.  
Por aquí Libia me hablaba  
cuando a<sup>1</sup> su gracia vivía:  
aquí su amor me decía,  
y de mi amor la informaba.  
Si Antonio trata en secreto  
el casamiento que dice  
la Duquesa, y contradice  
la lengua al alma en efeto,  
cuán cierto será acudir  
a este puesto a requebralla;  
que esto de negarme amalla,  
es un discreto fingir.  
Porque dando por disculpa  
que por fuerza le casó  
la Duquesa, tendré yo  
después la pena y la culpa.  
Pues impedirlo me importa,  
o a lo menos saber bien  
si con la espada, tan bien  
como con la lengua corta.  
¡Válame Dios! ¿Quién abrió  
aquella secreta puerta?  
Porque eternamente abierta  
hombre de casa la vio.  
Es de un caracol que sube  
al cuarto de la Duquesa.  
¡Ay, desengaño, qué apriesa  
quitas a mi sol la nube!

225

230

235

240

245

250

Sale Libia con un niño<sup>2</sup> en los brazos.

Libia            ¡Ce<sup>3</sup>, Antonio!

Urbino                            Antonio llamó,  
y la voz de Libia es:

1. A, D: en

2. B: una niña

3. D: eh



- ¿Diráme Antonio después:  
 "la Duquesa me forzó"?  
 ¿Que pido más desengaño 255  
 a las dudas ni a los celos?  
 ¡Noche, luna, estrellas, cielos,  
 sed testigos de mi engaño!  
 Libia ¿Oyes,<sup>1</sup> Antonio?  
 Urbino ¿Qué aguardo?  
 Fingiré que Antonio soy; 260  
 tan apasionado estoy,  
 que de llegar me acobardo.  
 Aquí estoy.
- Libia Pues toma presto;  
 que no puedo detenerme.  
Dale el niño y vase.  
 Adiós.
- Urbino Cual hombre que duerme, 265  
 esta quimera he<sup>2</sup> compuesto,  
 ¡cielo santo! ¿Estoy en mí?  
 ¿Qué es aquesto que me ha dado?  
 Cosa es viva, y que ha llorado.  
 ¿Lloró? Sospecho que sí. 270  
 ¿Qué dudo? Criatura es.  
 ¡Desdichada suerte mía,  
 o suya, pues este día  
 en Argel pone los pies.  
 Si de mis locos engaños 275  
 desengaños pretendí,  
 a fe que me han dado aquí  
 bien claros los desengaños.  
 Yo pedía de otro modo  
 ver un hombre solo hablando, 280  
 mas no un niño que, llorando,  
 me desengañe del todo.  
 A otros hombres, de su engaño  
 dan palabra;<sup>3</sup> mas a mí,  
 las obras me han dado aquí 285  
 por último desengaño.

1. C: oye2. A, B, C: ha3. A, D: palabras

Ya, ¿qué tengo que saber?  
 ¿A que pruebas me apercibo?  
 Pues un desengaño vivo  
 me basta a satisfacer. 290  
 Celos, ¿qué buscáis, después  
 de haber visto claro el daño,  
 pues os dan un desengaño  
 con ojos, manos y pies?  
 Las sospechas y el amor 295  
 dicen que engendran los celos:  
 ¡qué cierta han hecho los cielos  
 esta junta en mi dolor!  
 ¡Qué amistades tan estrechas,  
 y qué cierto el parto ha sido! 300  
 Pues este niño ha nacido  
 de su amor y mis sospechas.  
 Muchos desearon ver  
 a los celos, por ser cosa  
 tan varia y dificultosa 305  
 para poderse entender.  
 Ya dicen que son antojos  
 que hacen las cosas mayores,  
 ya que piedras de colores  
 que están burlando los ojos; 310  
 ya dicen que envidia son,  
 ya que crédito perdido,  
 ya que un monstruo mal nacido  
 del temor y la opinión.  
 Y yo, tras tantos desvelos, 315  
 digo que este niño vea  
 quien verlos vivos<sup>1</sup> desea,  
 porque este niño es los celos.  
 Un hombre viene, y sin duda  
 que es Antonio.

Sale Antonio, de noche.

Antonio	¿Si he tardado?	320
	Que me ha tenido ocupado	
	quien mi gozo en llanto muda.	
	Viene Otavió a pretender	



	otra vez el casamiento	
	de la Duquesa. Aquí siento	325
	gente. ¡Ay, Dios! ¿Quién puede ser?	
	Ya me ha visto, y pues me vio,	
	saber será bien quién es.	
	¿Si es Otavio, que después	
	de hablarle, <sup>1</sup> aquí me siguió?	330
	¡Válgame Dios! Nunca vi	
	de noche en este lugar	
	gente, ni pasar ni estar;	
	hoy es todo contra mí.	
	No sé qué anoche soñé:	335
	hoy vino Otavio, hoy me ha dado	
	el secretario cuidado.	
	Él se está quedo; ¿qué haré?	
	Pero ¿qué remedio tiene?	
	¡Ah, caballero! ¿No piensa	340
	que es de aquesta casa ofensa	
	si aquí se para y detiene?	
	¿No sabe el recogimiento	
	y de su dueño el estado?	
	Desde el balcón le he mirado,	345
	y con justo sentimiento	
	le vengo a quitar de aquí;	
	vaya, el mayordomo soy.	
Urbino	Mejor dijérades, hoy,	
	mayor traidor para mí.	350
Antonio	¿Es Urbino?	
Urbino	¿Son aquestas	
	las palabras?	
Antonio	¿Yo he quebrado	
	palabra que os haya dado,	
	ni merezco esas respuestas?	
Urbino	Respondiera con la espada	355
	a un hidalgo tan villano,	
	a no tener esta mano	
	con vuestra sangre ocupada.	
	Aunque no era mucho error	
	ponérosíla por broquel,	360

para que vos,dando en él  
 me vengárades mejor.  
 Aquí llegué y me llamó  
 Libia,que por vos me tuvo,  
 porque sólo se detuvo,  
 cuanto lo que veis me dio.  
 Pues,¿cómo,Antonio,tenéis  
 hijos de Libia,y decís  
 que os fuerzan?¡Qué bien fingís!  
 ¡Qué buen mayordomo hacéis!  
 Gozáisla con tanto espacio,  
 que tenéis hijos,y os pesa  
 de que os case la Duquesa.  
 Fruta llaman de palacio  
 los abrazos y los besos,  
 pero aqueste plato no;  
 que quien a tanto llegó,  
 pasó de honestos sucesos.  
 Tomad allá vuestro hijo:  
 no digáis que somos dos  
 contra vos;que es otro vos,  
 y de tenerle me aflijo.  
 Llevadle al hombro,pues es  
 vuestra justa obligación;  
 que conforme a la traición  
 me satisfaré después.  
 Por su inocencia me aparto;  
 que ser alcahuete siento,  
 ya que no del casamiento,  
 de la vergüenza del parto.  
 ¡Buena cuenta dado habéis  
 del honor de la Duquesa!  
 ¡Vive el cielo,que me pesa,  
 porque no le merecéis,  
 de haberos el niño dado;  
 que más justa lealtad fuera  
 que allá su Excelencia viera  
 testigo tan abonado,  
 que aunque es de tan poca edad,

365

370

375

380

385

390

395



lo creyera la Duquesa,  
 porque en lo poco que pesa  
 prueba vuestra liviandad.  
 Mas basta:yo le diré  
 que un mayordomo traidor,  
 con ser mi mayor dolor,  
 su mayor deshonor<sup>1</sup> fue.

400

405

Váyase Urbino.

Antonio      ¿Viose tal confusión como la mía?  
 ¿A cuál hombre del mundo sucediera  
 que de dos años,el error de un día,  
 el más secreto amor público hiciera?      410  
 Mas no quejarme con razón debería  
 de mi fortuna,humanamente fiera,  
 pues ya que tanto mal me ha sucedido,  
 ha errado el blanco donde el tiro ha sido.  
 El amor de su Libia le ha engañado,      415  
 los celos este bien me han hecho<sup>1</sup>ay,cielos,  
 cuánto quedo a sus celos obligado!  
 Más fueron para mí celos que celos.  
 Del honor de Camila confiado,  
 vencido de sus ansias y desvelos,      420  
 a Libia lo atribuye,que en efeto,  
 sufrirá el deshonor<sup>2</sup>por el secreto.  
 Que de que éste lo diga a la Duquesa  
 no puede enojo alguno resultarme,  
 pues vengarse de mí no es tanta empresa,      425  
 que no sepa del daño repararme.  
 ¡Hija del alma,<sup>3</sup>caminad apriesa;  
 que quieren mis desdichas acabarme,  
 y si por dicha el sobrescrito os vieran,  
 vieran que para mí las cartas eran!      430  
 ¡Ángel,un libro sois de mi secreto;  
 guardaros quiero,que ninguno os lea;  
 que es la cifra mayor vuestro conceto,  
 que amor a tantos encubrir desea!  
 Un mayordomo soy;vos,en efeto,  
 el libro de mis cuentas;nadie os vea;

1.the metre seems to require an elision of hecho and ay

2.A:deshonra

3.C:hija del agua

que soy humilde y es mi dueño altivo,  
y no alcanzan los gastos al recibo.  
Venid, y acompañad a vuestro hermano  
con aquellos honrados labradores, 440  
que con su<sup>1</sup> pecho tan sincero y llano,  
darán sustento y os dirán amores.  
Vuestra inocencia, con piadosa mano,  
para cosas más dignas y mayores  
ampare el cielo; que lo que él defiende, 445  
en vano el hombre deshacer pretende.

Váyanse.

Salgan Doristo y Bartola, labradores.

Doristo	A la villa tengo de ir si os pesa cuarenta veces.	
Bartola	Bien a quien eres pareces.	
Doristo	No hay quien os pueda sufrir. ¿Caséme con vos, Bartola, para estar siempre con vos?	450
Bartola	A lo menos, manda Dios que me queráis a mí sola.	
Doristo	¿Quién os lo dijo?	
Bartola	¡Oh, qué bien! El cura que me casó.	455
Doristo	Y eso ¿no lo cumplo yo como en el monte lo ven?	
Bartola	No lo cumples, pues te vas y con mil celos me dejas.	460
Doristo	Con poca razón te quejas.	
Bartola	¡Ay, mi bien, no puedo más!	
Doristo	Eso de celos, Bartola, muy de las ciudades es.	
Bartola	Si es así, no me los des, pues son <sup>2</sup> de la ciudad sola. Pero bien saben los cielos de aqueste dolor profundo, que en cualquier parte del mundo que hay amor, ha de haber celos. Como el relqj del lugar	465      470

1. B: un

2. C: es



sin las ruedas no lo fuera,  
 o sin cobre la espetera,  
 o sin platos el vasar;  
 como casa sin techumbre 475  
 y jardín sin hortelano,  
 como un almiraz sin mano,  
 como un alnafa sin lumbre;  
 como pila sin hisopo,  
 como fea sin afeite, 480  
 como sartén sin aceite,  
 y como rueca sin copo;  
 como migas sin tocino,  
 como enfermo sin regalos,  
 como tamboril sin palos, 485  
 como albarda sin pollino,  
 o berros sin anapelos,  
 o labranza sin cortijos,  
 como casados sin hijos,  
 parece el amor sin celos. 490

Doristo      Bartola, muy sabia estáis;  
 yo os voto al sol que me aprieta  
 mucho el veros tan discreta.  
 ¿Dónde diablos<sup>1</sup> estudiáis?  
 ¿Habéisos topado acaso 495  
 con algún libro del cura?

Bartola      Amor me enseña, y me apura  
 en el fuego en que me abraso.

Doristo      Mas apostemos que son  
 liciones del sacristán. 500

Bartola      Hartas los celos me dan,  
 si es la escuela el corazón.

Doristo      ¡Toma, si afloja!

Bartola                      Pues di,  
 ¿a quien no ha enseñado amor?

Doristo      Que me dejes es mejor, 505  
 Bartola, salir de aquí;  
 que no es discreta mujer  
 la que el marido cautiva;

déjame que libre viva,  
 pues no te voy a ofender. 510  
 Si siempre quieres que esté  
 en casa, y siempre te vea,  
 cree que parece fea  
 cosa que siempre se ve.  
 Vista siempre en una casa 515  
 una mujer viene a ser  
 una silla, y no mujer,  
 una artesa en que se masa.  
 Más parece la espetera  
 que la mujer, y así es justo 520  
 que venga picado el <sup>1</sup>gusto,  
 y ande el marido fuera.  
 Tras eso, descubre un hombre  
 que siempre ha de estar con ellas,  
 mil faltas, Bartola, en ellas, 525  
 de que aun no supiera el nombre.  
 Velas tocar y afeitar,  
 al arquilla y al espejo,  
 y una mujer en bosquejo  
 es terrible de mirar. 530  
 Hallar la mujer tocada  
 y la mesa puesta, es cosa  
 limpia, agradable y curiosa;  
 verla guisar, mucho enfada.  
 De la mujer el regalo, 535  
 como pastel ha de ser,  
 que no se ha de ver hacer,  
 porque hay mosca, pelo y palo.  
 Las libres y las casadas  
 con este engaño navegan 540  
 en su gusto, que unas ruegan,  
 y las otras son rogadas.  
 Gente parece que siento.  
 Bartola Atando un caballo está  
 un hombre.  
 Doristo Él viene hacia acá. 545



Sale Antonio.

Antonio Corriendo he vencido el<sup>1</sup> viento,  
pero más supo correr  
el día, pues me alcanzó;  
mas donde me amaneció,  
ninguno me pudo ver. 550

A las tapias desta huerta  
dos pastores están. ¡Hola!  
¿Cuál cortijo es de Bartola?

Bartola El se ha perdido y no acierta.

Doristo Antes tu nombre nombró. 555

Bartola ¿Si es nuesamo?

Doristo El mismo es.

Bartola Dadnos, mi señor, los pies.

Antonio ¿Es Doristo?

Doristo Luego ¿no?

Antonio ¿Es Bartola?

Bartola ¿No lo ve?

Antonio ¿Mi hijo?

Doristo Está con dos barbas. 560

Bartola Bueno; a las primeras parvas,  
pondrá sobre el trillo el pie.

Antonio ¿Pariste, Bartola?

Bartola ¡Ay Dios,  
seis días ha que lo enterré!

Doristo O fue mi desdicha, o fue 565  
prenóstico de los dos;  
que el uno y otro decía  
que el mochacho<sup>2</sup> había de ser  
de la Igreja, por tener  
algo de la Igreja un día. 570  
Y tan presto se cumplió,  
que es suyo, aunque sin oficio,  
hasta el día del juicio.

Antonio ¡Qué bien que me sucedió!

Bartola Si sabe de algún criado, 575  
pues ya ve cómo los crío,  
y que el suyo, aunque ya mío,  
de año y medio destetado,  
está como un elefante,  
encamínemele acá. .

1. D: a12. B: muchacho

Antonio De uno sé, y tan cerca está,  
que ya le tenéis delante.  
Ésta es una niña bella,  
desotro muchacho hermana,  
porque el sol de tal mañana  
tenga aurora, tenga estrella. 585

Bartola Suelte, señor. ¡Ay, bendiga  
el cielo tan linda cara!  
¡Quién tal ventura pensara!

Doristo Bartola, dale una higa. 590

Bartola Una y mil. ¡Guárdete Dios,  
y qué risa! Hablarme quiere.

Antonio Mi buena dicha se infiere  
de hallaros aquí a los dos.

Bartola ¡Por el siglo de mi abuelo,  
que parece que me pide  
el pecho, que luz despide  
destos dos ojos del cielo!  
¡Mi vida, mi emperadora,  
mi duquesa!

Antonio Bueno está. 600

Doristo Como esas cosas dirá.  
¿No veis que está loca agora?  
Dice que habla, de dos días,  
y que le pide la teta;  
que a la mujer más discreta  
enloquecen niñerías. 605  
Tose una niña y dirá  
su madre que taita dijo.

Antonio Vamos a ver a mi hijo,  
amos, ya que vengo acá, 610  
Y dejaréles dineros.

Doristo ¿El caballo?

Antonio Allí le até.

Doristo Desde la choza se ve,  
y aquí siempre hay ganaderos.  
¿Quitástele el freno?

Antonio Allí, 615  
pace la hierba con él.



Bartola ¡Qué azucena y qué clavel!  
 Esto, Doristo, parí;  
 vivo está, consuelo tengo;  
 vete ahora donde quieras. 620

Doristo ¿Que ya me dejas de veras?

Bartola Con este bien me entretengo.

Doristo Luego, ¿ya no me querrás?

Bartola No hay que tratar de quererte,  
 porque es la niña de suerte 625  
 que la quiero mucho más.

Doristo Si ansí remedias tus daños,  
 también yo voy a buscar  
 otra niña que criar,  
 de hasta catorce a quince años. 630

Váyanse.

Salen la Duquesa y Urbino.

Duquesa Si es, Urbino, el secreto por Otavio,  
 no quiero que le tomes en la boca.

Urbino No es de Otavio el secreto;<sup>1</sup> que ya creo  
 que de Otavio de Médicis te burlas,  
 y de cuantos te hablaren<sup>2</sup> en casarte. 635

Duquesa Pues, ¿qué puedes querer con<sup>3</sup> tal secreto?

Urbino No quisiera, señora, que este día  
 en que Vuestra Excelencia se levanta  
 de enfermedad tan larga y melancólica,  
 que la tuvo dos meses en la cama, 640  
 para dar alegría a sus estados,  
 a su casa y vasallos, yo viniera  
 a entristecella en pago deste gusto.

Duquesa ¿Cosas, Urbino, son que pueden darme  
 tristeza a mí?

Urbino Tu discreción bien puede 645  
 tomarlas de otra suerte; que por eso  
 pintó al entendimiento un sabio antiguo  
 con un peso en la mano, que tenía  
 en la<sup>4</sup> balanza la fortuna,

1. C: secretario

2. D: hablan

3. B: en

4. D: una

con naves rotas, con perdidos bienes, 650  
 con honras por el suelo derribadas,  
 con cetros, con imperios adquiridos,  
 con laureles, con triunfos y con armas,  
 y en la otra una pluma solamente.

Duquesa No estoy para que agora me des pena. 655  
 Urbino Siempre me escuchas mal.

Duquesa Vete en buen hora.

Urbino Así gobiernan siempre las mujeres.  
 ¡Plega al cielo que llegue presto el día  
 en que de mis desprecios<sup>1</sup> te arrepientas!

Duquesa Vuelve; ¿qué dices?

Urbino Que tu bien procuro. 660

Duquesa Veamos, pues, ¿qué es esto que encareces?

Urbino ¿No es para encarecer que anoche, estando  
 paseando el terrero, me llamase  
 Libia, que imaginó que yo era Antonio,  
 y me diese un testigo de su infamia? 665

Duquesa ¿Cómo testigo?

Urbino Una criatura envuelta  
 en un manteo.

Duquesa ¡Válganme los cielos!  
 Y tú, ¿qué piensas deso?

Urbino Que era suya,  
 y que los dos te han hecho tanto agravio.

Duquesa ¿Que criatura te dio?

Urbino Fue tan sin duda, 670  
 que quise entrar con ella hasta tu cama.

Duquesa Debiste de soñar.

Urbino Sí, sueño era;  
 y así, como hombre que soñando estaba,  
 arrojé la criatura en una acequia.

Duquesa ¡Mal cristiano! ¿Qué dices?

Urbino Si era sueño, 675  
 ¿qué importa que en la acequia la arrojase?

Duquesa Oye, ¡por Dios! que si es verdad, es cosa  
 de mayor compasión que no mi agravio.

Urbino Pues fue verdad lo que de Libia digo,  
 mas no el haberla echado, porque Antonio 680



venía ya por ella.

Duquesa                                      ¿Y quién la tiene?

Urbino            A Antonio se la di.

Duquesa                                  Mejor hiciste;

que a Dios ha de mirarse sobre todo:

grande es mi agravio;pero,en fin,es alma

que a Dios costó su sangre.<sup>1</sup> ay, honor mío! 685

**¡Ay, el recogimiento de mi casa!**

Antonio, de quien yo mi honor fiaba,

¿ha hecho tal maldad? Llámame a Libia.

Urbino            Señora, si en tu casa se entendiese

este suceso, por ventura luego 690

por toda Italia se sabrá y podrían

decir algunos, con dañados ánimos,

de quien no es tu virtud tan conocida.

alguna cosa que tu honor disfame.

Duquesa      ¿Qué me aconsejas, secretario amigo?      695

Urbino, ¿qué haré yo? ¡Válgame el cielo!

**¿Llamaré mis hermanos?**

Urbino Lo que puedes

remediar en secreto, ¿agora pones

en contingencia de que sea tan público?

Duquesa      Haré matar a Antonio.

Urbino	Aun eso es cosa	700
--------	-----------------	-----

más segura.

Duquesa                      Pues alto: ¡Antonio muera!

Pero, ¿qué diré yo? Pues no es posible

que deje de saberse y sospecharse,

y es Antonio, en efecto, caballero.

Casarlos es mejor.

Urbino                      Si tú los casas                      705

también sospecharán que lo sabías

y que en tu casa pasan estas cosas.

Duquesa      Pues, ¿qué he de hacer?

Urbino Echalle de tu casa.

Duquesa      Bien dices, pues, sin darle cuenta a Libia

de la razón de aqueste injusto agravio,

echaré al mayordomo fementido.

y después me podré vengar de todos.

1.the metre seems to require an elision of sangre and ay

¡Oh, consejo discreto! ¡Oh, sabio Urbino,  
que nunca yo estimé tu entendimiento!  
Pues ahora que el cielo me castiga, 715  
tú serás el gobierno de mi casa,  
tú mi mano derecha, tú mi hacienda.  
Llama algunos criados, y con ellos  
venga Antonio también.

Urbino De aqueste modo,  
con discreción procederás en todo. 720

Váyase Urbino

Duquesa ¿Hay suerte más cruel,<sup>1</sup> Antonio mío?  
¿Cómo tardaste para tanto daño?  
Mas pues quedó en su fuerza nuestro engaño,  
culpar nuestra fortuna<sup>2</sup> es desvarío.  
Cuando nació mi hijo, en quien confío 725  
de toda mi desdicha el desengaño,  
hubo secreto, hubo rigor extraño;  
trajo consigo de varón el brío.  
Cuando nace mi hija, los placeres  
del parto mudan en pesar los nombres; 730  
y se pone mi honor en pareceres.  
Hija, no es mucho que a tu padre asombres,  
porque desde que nacen las mujeres  
comienza la desdicha de los hombres.

Salen Furio, Filelfo, Dinarco, Ruperto, Urbino y Celso.

Urbino Aquí están Furio y Ruperto 735  
con Filelfo y con Dinarco.

Furio ¿Qué mandas?

Duquesa Hoy es muy cierto  
que en mi deshonor me embarco.  
Y tomo en la muerte puerto.  
¿No está en casa Antonio?

Filelfo Agora 740  
dicen que viene de fuera.

Sale Antonio.

Antonio ¿La Duquesa, mi señora  
me llama?

Duquesa Todo me altera;

1.C: ¿Hay más suerte cruel?

2.D: desdicha



- finge el rostro, el alma llora.
- Antonio ¿Qué manda Vuestra Excelencia, 745  
que junta tantos criados?
- Duquesa Hago de mi casa audencia,  
porque ha de haber reformados  
de mi salario y presencia.  
Furio, tú, porque has servido 750  
al Duque (que tiene al cielo)  
y porque leal has sido,  
en premio de tu buen celo,  
no te riño ni despido;  
sé que mi casa anda mal: 755  
al fin, casa de mujer.
- Furio Toda es gente principal;  
la información puede ser  
no ser a la culpa igual.  
Nueva cosa me parece 760  
lo que dices, lo que haces.
- Filelfo Alguien que no lo merece,  
y de quien te satisfaces,  
estas máquinas<sup>1</sup> te ofrece,  
y serán torres de viento. 765
- Duquesa Filelfo, ya por mi agravio  
son piedra en el fundamento;  
bien sé que eres cuerdo y sabio,  
conozco tu entendimiento;  
quédate en casa también; 770  
que como Furio has servido.
- Filelfo Pagas mis servicios bien.
- Dinarco Ya, señora, estoy corrido  
de los ojos que me ven.  
¿Soy yo aquel que te ofendió?<sup>2</sup> 775
- Duquesa No, Dinarco.
- Dinarco Porque yo  
siempre te he sido leal.
- Celso Mas, ¿qué viene a ser el mal  
donde jamás se pensó?  
¿Son, por dicha, aquestas canas 780

1. C: esta máquina

2. B: te he ofendido; C: te ha ofendido

de quien tienes esas quejas?  
 Porque tardes y mañanas,  
 estas puertas, estas rejas,  
 corredores y ventanas,  
 saben que no me he quitado  
 solo un punto de asistir  
 a lo que soy<sup>1</sup> obligado. 785

Duquesa Celso, ¿quién puede decir  
 que vos me habéis enojado?  
 Como a mi padre os respeto. 790

Celso Ya mis lágrimas, señora,  
 muestran un piadoso efeto  
 de mi voluntad.

Ruperto Agora  
 descifrarás el secreto.  
 ¿Es Ruperto, por ventura? 795

Duquesa No eres tú.

Urbino Pues yo seré;  
 que bien estarás segura  
 que no es Antonio, ni fue,  
 quien tu disgusto procura.

Duquesa Ni fue Ruperto ni Urbino. 800

Antonio Luego, ¿yo soy? ¿No respondes?  
 Ya la ocasión imagino,  
 y pues tu rostro me escondes,  
 alguien a informarte vino.  
 Pues, ¿a un hombre que has fiado  
 tu casa, hacienda, tu estado,  
 tu honor, tu hijo, condenas,  
 sin oírle, a tantas penas?  
 ¡Oh, qué bien te han informado!  
 No te quiero replicar, 810  
 sé que te sobra razón:  
 pero quien te vino a dar  
 tan presto la información,  
 tendrá presto que llorar.

Duquesa Villano descomedido, 815  
 deshonra de aquesta casa,  
 no respondáis atrevido,



ya sé todo lo que pasa;  
lealtad y justicia ha sido.  
Salid luego al punto della. 820

Celso ¿Qué habrá hecho el mayordomo,  
Furio, que ansí le atropella?

Furio No lo sé.

Duquesa Sí aquí no tomo  
venganza de vos y della,  
es, infame, porque sé... 825

Júntese a él:quedo.

¡Ay, mi Antonio, esto he fingido  
por quien lo sabe y lo ve!

Antonio

Quedo.

Discreción, señora, ha sido,  
ya que mi desdicha fue.

Duquesa

Recio.

Salte de mi casa al punto. 830

Quedo.

Mi gloria, mi luz, mi esposo,  
todo el bien me lleváis junto;  
que en destierro tan lloroso,  
queda el corazón difunto.

Recio.

No estéis un momento aquí;  
que os haré matar. 835

Antonio

El cielo

volverá presto por mí.

Quedo.

¡Con qué extraño desconsuelo  
me aparto, mi bien, de ti!

Duquesa

Quedo.

No se te dé, amores, nada:  
de secreto me verás. 840

Antonio

Recio.

Estás, señora, enojada,  
no quiero decirte más...

Quedo.

de que eres de mí adorada.  
 Tu hija y mía llevé,  
 y tal mi ventura fue,  
 que la que el niño crió,  
 ha seis días que parió,  
 y sin hijo la hallé.

845

Duquesa

Recio.

No hay disculpa;vete luego.

850

Quedo.

¿Que muerto el hijo tenía?

Antonio

Todo aquel desasosiego  
 perdió con la nueva cría.

Duquesa

Quedo.

¡Que vivan al cielo ruego;  
 que,a pesar de mis hermanos,  
 serás mío:no repliques!

855

Antonio

Recio.

¡Que con testigos villanos  
 tanto deshonor publiques!  
 ¿Esto esperé de tus manos?

Duquesa

Tómele Filelfo cuenta.  
 Venid,Urbino,conmigo,  
 y no hable en vuestra afrenta;  
 que le haré matar.

860

Antonio

No digo

cosa,aunque mil cosas sienta.

Duquesa

Agradézcalo al sagrado.

865

Váyase la Duquesa.

Urbino

Él merece ese respeto,  
 y sin él yo soy honrado,  
 pues no le<sup>1</sup>debo secreto  
 habiendo sido engañado;  
 fuera de que el ser leal  
 más lo debo a la Duquesa  
 que no a un hombre desleal.

870

Váyase Urbino.



Antonio, mucho me pesa,  
siendo hombre tan principal,  
de que hayáis dado ocasión 875  
tan notable a Su Excelencia.

Antonio Toda es falsa información.  
Filelfo Mostrad aquí la prudencia,  
Antonio, y la discreción.  
Yo no sé que estéis culpado; 880  
quizá agora son enojos,  
y estoy de Urbino enojado;  
siempre os tuvo envidia.

Antonio Y tal 885  
que me ha puesto en lo que veis.

Celso No querrá el villano igual;  
que lo que vos merecéis,  
siempre lo ha sufrido mal.  
Es cólera de mujer; 890  
dejad pasar estos días.

Antonio Celso, no hay que pretender  
(soy hombre) que niñerías  
me pueden descomponer.  
Todos sabéis que serví 895  
al Rey de Nápoles yo;  
sabéis que estimado fui,  
y que no me despidió,  
como me sucede aquí.

Ah, señores poderosos 900  
para hacer y deshacer!

Celso Todos vamos temerosos.

Antonio Y de mi honor puede ser  
que vais sospechosos.

Váyanse.

Salen Otavio y Fabricio, que quieren ir a caza.

Otavio Haz que luego se aderece 905  
de monte aquel español.

Fabricio De los caballos del sol,  
ser el primero merece.  
¿Qué mochila<sup>1</sup> le pondrán?

Otavio La de plata y encarnado. 910  
 Fabricio Cazador enamorado,  
 con razón te llamarán;  
 lo verde es al campo igual.  
 Otavio No hay verde que bien me venga,  
 Fabricio, mientras no tenga 915  
 nueva esperanza mi mal.  
 Despréciame la Duquesa  
 con servicios de tres años.  
 Fabricio ¿Y con tantos desengaños  
 sigues tan cansada empresa? 920  
 Otavio ¿Qué tengo de hacer, Fabricio,  
 si nací para querer  
 esta divina mujer?  
 Este ángel de mi juicio,  
 esta Circe de mi engaño, 925  
 esta luna de mi humor,  
 donde, pidiendo favor,  
 siempre me dan desengaño?  
 Al monte me voy agora  
 por desechar pensamientos, 930  
 y porque lleven los vientos  
 esta esperanza traidora.  
 ¡Plega a Dios que allá quedéis  
 y conmigo no volváis,  
 que en mis suspiros salgáis 935  
 y descansar me dejéis!  
 Fabricio Sobre dejar la esperanza  
 él que ama, era conceto  
 de un discreto, harto discreto,  
 esta aguda semejanza: 940  
 hay unos dardos atados  
 al brazo con un cordel,  
 que vuelven más recio a él,  
 señor, después de tirados.  
 Así de quien tiene amor 945  
 con esperanzas ajenas,  
 salen a veces las penas,  
 y vuelven con más furor.



Ótavio           No lo comparaba mal,  
                   pues cuanto más los desecho,                   950  
                   más recios vuelven al pecho,  
                   ya de sus tiros mortal.

Sale Urbino.

[āparte]

                  Al campo se parte Otavio.

Ótavio           ¡Oh, secretario!

Urbino                           ¡Oh, señor,  
                   ¿qué es esto?

Ótavio                           Engaños de amor,                   955  
                   y desengaños de un sabio,  
                   el ejercicio aconseja;  
                   voy a caza con Fabricio.

Urbino           Es muy bueno el ejercicio;  
                   mucho el pensamiento aleja.                   960

Ótavio           ¿Qué hay de aquel ángel cruel?

Urbino           Está en extremo enojada,  
                   y, de enojo, retirada.

Ótavio           Y retirada con él.

                  ¡Ay, Dios, quien su enojo fuera!                   965  
                   ¿No sabremos la ocasión?

Urbino           Cosas de su casa son;  
                   cualquier sombra le <sup>1</sup>altera.

Ótavio           Notables sospechas tomo. <sup>2</sup>  
                   ¿Es por mí?

Urbino                           Por vos, ¿por qué?                   970  
                   Con su ~~mayordomo~~ fue.

Ótavio           ¡Jesús! ¡Con el mayordomo!  
                   Menos imposible siento  
                   criar España leones,  
                   el fuego camaleones,                   975  
                   y salamandras el viento;  
                   haber en Citia azahar,  
                   y hielos en Etiopia.

Urbino           Es de suerte, que ella propia  
                   cuentas le quiere tomar;                   980

1. B: la

2. C: temo

.	y quedan solos los dos	
.	donde la da tan estrecha,	
	que ni el ingenio aprovecha	
	ni la privanza, <sup>1</sup> ¡por Dios!	
	ya le tiene despedido.	985
Otavio	¿Despedido? ¡Caso grave!	
	¿Y la causa no se sabe?	
Urbino	Sospecho que se ha sabido	
	y no se puede decir.	
Otavio	¿Cómo no? ¡Por Dios, que creo	990
	que me matase el deseo!	
Urbino	Pues bien os podéis morir;	
	que por la fe de hijodalgo,	
	que es imposible decillo.	
Otavio	De quien soy me maravillo,	995
	y de lo poco que valgo.	
	Fabricio, apártate <sup>2</sup> un poco.	
Fabricio	Afuera aguardo.	
Otavio	Ya, Urbino,	
	estoy solo.	
Urbino	Es caso indino.	
Otavio	Haréis que me vuelva loco.	1000
Urbino	Palabra me habéis de dar,	
	como caballero, Otavio,	
	de callar, porque es agravio	
	que a muchos puede tocar;	
	y ya que por afición	1005
	y amistad a vos lo digo,	
	no es razón...	
Otavio	Urbino, amigo,	
	no hay que acabar la razón.	
	¡Vive Dios, que eternamente	
	lo diga a persona alguna!	1010
Urbino	Anoche, dada la una,	
	me llevó cierto accidente	
	a pasear el terrero;	
	Libia a la puerta salió,	
	y "Antonio, Antonio" llamó.	1015

1.D:tardanza2.B:aparte



Llegué, y cuando hablarla quiero,  
me pone (tiemblo en decillo)  
una criatura en los brazos.  
¡Tomara mejor dos lazos,  
o a la garganta un cuchillo! 1020  
En fin, pensó que la daba  
a su Antonio, que llegó  
al mismo punto que yo  
en los brazos la tomaba.  
Díselo, y desafiéle 1025  
sobre traición de amistad;  
guardé a la casa lealtad,<sup>1</sup>  
como él que es hidalgo suele,  
y contélo a la Duquesa,  
que hoy también se levantó. 1030  
Otavio Pues, ¿quién pensáis que parió?  
Urbino Libia.  
Otavio ¡Buena gracia es ésa!  
¿No sois más necio?  
Urbino Pues, ¿quién?  
Otavio Esos dos meses que ha estado  
mala, encubriendo el preñado 1035  
pudiera decir más bien.  
Y por esta vida, Urbino,  
y del Duque mi señor,  
que tiene secreto amor  
la Duquesa!  
Urbino No imagino 1040  
que hay en Amalfi con quién,  
pues en casa es disparate,  
que hoy he estorbado que mate  
a Antonio, y vos sabéis bien  
su grande recogimiento. 1045  
Otavio No fíes de hipocresías.  
Urbino Mis celosas fantasías  
tienen justo fundamento.  
La Duquesa ha despedido  
a Antonio, y le toma cuenta, 1050

1.C omits this line.

- y esto con pública afrenta,  
 y ha llorado, y se ha escondido;  
 según esto, no es Antonio.
- Otavio                      Mal conocéis un monjil:  
                               no suele ser más sutil                      1055  
                               el enredo del demonio.  
 Así parió la Duquesa,  
 como yo soy yo.
- Urbino                                      ¿De quién?
- Otavio                      De algún duende que no ven  
                               los ojos a quien le pesa.                      1060  
 Ya me espantaba de ver  
 tanta mocedad con luto,  
 pues no es campo que da fruto  
 sin labrador, la mujer.
- Urbino                      ¡Por Dios, que yo me alegrara,  
                               aunque infamia en ella fuera!  
 Pero, señor, considera...
- Otavio                      No hay qué, pues la culpa es clara.
- Urbino                      Pues, ¿cómo de Antonio fía  
                               su honor, y despide a Antonio?                      1070
- Otavio                      Pues, ¿qué mayor testimonio  
                               de aquesta sospecha mía?  
                               ¿No ves que por encubrir  
                               su infamia le finge echar?  
 Y el encerrarse a contar,                      1075  
                               ¿piensas que es para refir?<sup>1</sup>  
 Da noticia a sus hermanos,  
 haz como hidalgo.
- Urbino                                      Señor,  
                               calificar es mejor  
                               estos pensamientos vanos;                      1080  
                               que, sabidos, yo seré  
                               quien primero le<sup>2</sup> destruya,  
                               aunque al infierno se huya.
- Otavio                      Y yo, celoso, ¿qué haré?  
                               ¡Ay de mí, Urbino, que estoy                      1085  
                               sin seso! Camila es mala,  
                               Camila a Faustina iguala.

1. C: morir2. B: lo



Urbino           ¿Dónde vas?

Otavio           A decir voy

a un monte, a un campo, estos celos.

¡Moriré, voy reventando! 1090

¿No basta morir amando,

sino con infamia? ¡Cielos,

maldigo vuestro rigor,

el día que tal pensé,

él que la vi, y él que fue 1095

causa de tenerla amor!

¡Montes, yo pensé que engaños

llevaba a vuestras defensas;

ya llevo ciertas ofensas,

ya llevo el fin de mis años! 1100

¡Uno de vosotros caiga

sobre mi cuerpo, o si no,

caiga del caballo yo,

muerto a Camila me traiga!

Váyase Otavio.

Urbino           Suele sonarse que hace un rey la guerra 1105

al África, y después volverse a Europa;

de un árbol suele amenazar la copa

un rayo, y luego todo el árbol yerra.

El toro a veces con el hombre cierra,

y quédase en los cuernos con la ropa; 1110

toma la nave el puerto, viento en popa,

que estuvo cerca de enemiga tierra.

Tal vez el fuego quema el alto asiento,

perdona<sup>1</sup> del pobre el corto abrigo,

y queda el trigo del granizo extento; 1115

reino, árbol, hombre, nave, casa, trigo,

libre de guerra, fuego, agua, mar, viento:

pues salvo y sano mi esperanza sigo.

1. D:y perdona

## ACTO TERCERO

Salen Antonio y Bernardo.

Bernardo Proseguid adelante vuestra historia,  
 porque son los sucesos más extraños  
 que ha visto el mundo en su inmortal memoria.

Antonio Temiendo resultar mayores daños,  
 me fingió despedir, Bernardo amigo; 5  
 en fin, estuve en Nápoles dos años.  
 De allí, más descuidado el enemigo,  
 me vine a Ancona, y con igual secreto,  
 el cielo solo de mi bien testigo,  
 caminaba de noche y, en efeto, 10  
 abriendo Libia una pequeña puerta,  
 gocé su hermosura y celestial sujeto.  
 Pero teniendo ya por cosa cierta  
 que está tercera vez preñada, ¡ay, cielos!  
 declararse con todos se conierta. 15  
 Y para asegurar tantos desvelos,  
 a Loreto ofrecida se ha fingido,  
 huyendo a Otavio y sus crueles celos,  
 y dejando a su hijo, que ha crecido  
 gallardamente, a gobernar su estado; 20  
 mejor que lo ha trazado, lo ha cumplido.

Bernardo ¿Su casa y sus vasallos ha dejado?

Antonio No ha podido sufrir mi larga ausencia  
 y los temores del tercer preñado.  
 De Loreto, con grande diligencia, 25  
 fingiendo ver esta ciudad de Ancona,  
 hoy pienso que ha de estar en mi presencia.  
 Y como amor cualquiera yerro abona,  
 decir quiere que está con su marido,  
 que estima en más que una imperial corona. 30  
 Que cuando toda Italia haya sabido  
 caso tan desigual, ya por lo menos  
 sabrán que en justo matrimonio ha sido.

Bernardo Pienso que sus hermanos, de ira llenos,  
 os han de perseguir.

Antonio Nadie lo duda; 35  
 mas yo fío de príncipes tan buenos,  
 que aquella espada contra mí desnuda,



envainará piedad de dos sobrinos,  
 como a la sangre la nobleza acuda.  
 Hoy vinieron mis<sup>1</sup> ángeles divinos 40  
 con un pastor, vestidos de villanos,  
 ocho años de sus padres peregrinos.

Bernardo Antonio, mucho temo estos hermanos  
 de la Duquesa.

Antonio Es gente poderosa;  
 mas pienso que serán en esto humanos. 45

Bernardo ¡El cielo, con su mano generosa,  
 del corazón les quite la venganza!

Sale Lucindo.

Lucindo Dame albricias de nueva tan dichosa.

Antonio ¿Vino ya la Duquesa?

Lucindo Tu esperanza  
 cumplen los cielos: ya ha llegado a  
 Ancona. 50

Antonio No viva más quien tanto bien alcanza.  
 ¡Dichosa vida que tal muerte abona!  
 ¡Mátenme los señores Aragonés,  
 que basta a un hombre humilde esta corona!  
 ¡Cielos para tan altas ocasiones 55  
 quiere la vida un noble!

Bernardo Es alta empresa,  
 mas notable el peligro a que te pones.

Antonio Viva casado yo con la Duquesa  
 un hora sola en tantos regocijos,  
 y máteme después a quien le pesa. 60  
 Vamos a recibilla; traed mis hijos;  
 conocerá si son suyos agora,  
 si miraren su sol con ojos fijos.

Bernardo ¡Oh, qué mal lo miró tan gran señora!

Váyanse.

Salgan todos los criados que puedan, y la Duquesa  
 y Libia, de camino; Urbino, secretario; Celso, Dinarco  
 y Filelfo.

Urbino Pues, ¿cómo en casa de Antonio 65  
 quieres, señora, posar?

Duquesa Con eso le quiero dar  
 de mi perdón testimonio.

Urbino	Pues, ¡al cabo de seis años que de tu casa salí, donde de tu hacienda dio en vez de cuentas, engaños, a la suya te has venido! ¿No hay aquí dos mil señores?	70
Duquesa	Pienso que son los <sup>1</sup> mejores si el dueño es conocido.	75
Urbino	Es pobre Antonio, señora.	
Duquesa	¿Cama y mesa no tendrá?	
Urbino	No hay que replicarte ya.	
Duquesa	Esto me conviene ahora.	80
<u>Sale Antonio con Doristo, y Alejandro, niño, vestido de villano, y Leonora, niña, de villanita.</u>		
Antonio	Señora, ¿Vuestra Excelencia honra aquesta pobre casa?	
Duquesa	¡Oh, Antonio!	
Dinarco	Lo que aquí pasa basta a quitar la paciencia.	
Furio	Callad, que más justo es posar en cas de un criado tan caballero y honrado.	85
Antonio	Dadme mil veces los pies.	
Duquesa	Tente, Antonio, que han de ser las cosas de otra manera.	90
Antonio	Quiero a tu divina esfera dos ángeles ofrecer.	
Duquesa	¿Quién son aquestos villanos?	
Doristo	Mis hijos, señora, son.	
Antonio	Echaldes la bendición. Hijos, besalde las manos.	95
Alejandro	¡Qué grande amor le he cobrado desde el punto que la vi!	
Leonora	Yo, Alejandro, siento en mí el corazón alterado.	100
Duquesa	¿Tenéis madre?	
Alejandro	Ya murió la madre que nos criaba.	



Doristo           La muerte todo lo acaba;  
                   en<sup>1</sup>agraz me la llevó.

Duquesa           ¿Vos, niño, cómo os llamáis?           105

Alejandro       Alejandro, mi señora.

Duquesa           ¿Y vos, mi niña?

Leonora                       Leonora.

Duquesa           Temor y amor, ¿qué aguardáis?  
                   ¿A qué vengo, si es que tengo  
                   tan justa resolución?           110  
                   Pues ya llegó la ocasión,  
                   sepan luego a lo que vengo.  
                   Estadme atentos, amigos,  
                   ya que declararme quiero,  
                   porque sepáis la ocasión           115  
                   de venir adonde vengo.  
                   Ya no es tiempo de callar;  
                   que si callé tanto tiempo,  
                   era esperando este día.

Urbino           ¡Válgame el cielo! ¿Qué es esto?           120

Dinarco           En gran confusión, señora,  
                   con la prevención que has hecho,  
                   hoy pones a tus criados:  
                   di, que ya estamos atentos.

Duquesa           Ya sabéis todos, amigos,           125  
                   que, el Duque, mi señor, muerto,  
                   quedé muy moza, y mi estado  
                   con hijo, aunque sin gobierno.  
                   Yo traje al señor Antonio  
                   de Nápoles, cuyo ingenio,           130  
                   cuya persona y valor  
                   sabe Italia, y todos vemos;  
                   mas como las excelencias  
                   de sus generosos méritos  
                   me diesen justa ocasión,           135  
                   puse los ojos en ellos.  
                   Esto no os parezca agora  
                   caso en el mundo tan nuevo,  
                   si en los Triunfos del Petrarca  
                   visteis de amor el ejemplo.           140

No hice mi honor infame  
 por imitar los remedios  
 que de Semíramis dicen  
 los que escribieron sus hechos;  
 que antes que el señor Antonio 145  
 me tocara sólo un dedo,  
 estaba con él casada,  
 o desposada en secreto.  
 Déj, como de mi marido,  
 aquestos dos hijos tengo; 150  
 que no es de Libia ninguno,  
 como han dicho algunos celos.  
 En un monte se han criado,  
 cuyo segundo suceso  
 me obligó que desterrase 155  
 de mi casa al mismo dueño.  
 Estos destierros, amigos,  
 son causa de muchos yerros:  
 cansados tienen mis ojos,  
 mis años tienen deshechos, 160  
 sospechosos mis hermanos,  
 mi honor de opiniones lleno,  
 y así, para fin de todo,  
 hoy a su casa me vengo.  
 El señor Antonio, amigos, 165  
 es mi marido; no quiero  
 título, estado, ni hacienda,  
 rentas, vasallos, ni reinos.  
 Señor os dejo en mi estado;  
 Amalfi tiene heredero; 170  
 ya el Duque es hombre, ya puede  
 ser de su hacienda gobierno;  
 ya<sup>1</sup> el Duque cifie espada,  
 con que sabrá defenderos,  
 y os podrá dar sucesión 175  
 con un igual casamiento.  
 Él que se quisiere ir  
 tendrá cartas y dineros;



.	Él que quisiera quedarse tendrá esta casa y mi pecho.	180
Urbino	Responded.	
Furio	¡Estoy sin mí!	
Urbino	Hablad vos.	
Dinarco	¡Estoy suspenso! Hable el más viejo de todos.	
Celso	Yo hablaré, como más viejo: señora, en cosa tan hecha, que no hay humano remedio que la pueda deshacer, ya no hay lugar de consejo. Dar tiene a Italia y a España que decir este suceso,	185       190
	que pensar a tus hermanos, y que sentir a tus deudos. Dios les pacifique a todos, que sólo Dios puede hacerlo; y sí hará, pues este amor es lícito casamiento. Estas canas, que en sus brazos, de un año, y menos, te vieron, ¿cómo te podrán dejar por respeto ni por miedo?	195       200
	Esta vida corta mía, señora, a tu lado ofrezco a cuchillo o al perdón, porque sin ti no la quiero. Serviré al señor Antonio, de cuyos merecimientos no tengo que te decir, pues le escogiste por dueño.	205
Duquesa	No lloréis, padre; que yo tengo esperanza en el cielo, que moverá a mis hermanos la sangre que dellos tengo, la inocencia destos niños, y el valor, partes e ingenio del señor Antonio, a quien, con ser quien soy, no merezco. ¿De qué te suspendes, Furio?	210       215

Furio                    Con tal razón me suspendo,  
que no me he atrevido a hablar  
por no decir lo que siento.                    220  
¡Ah, señora, cuántas veces  
tuve deste mal recelos!  
¡Cuántas señales me daban  
tus ojos, lenguas del pecho!  
Pero ya no hay que decirte;                    225  
perdóname si me alejo  
de tu servicio este día,  
teniendo justo respeto  
al señor Duque, tu hijo,  
a cuyo servicio vuelvo                    230  
por lo que debo a su padre,  
a quien tal ofensa has hecho.

Váyase Furio.

Dinarco                Señora, en esta desgracia  
muchas cosas considero  
que me obligan a dejarte,                    235  
y no es la menor, que pienso  
el daño que te amenaza.  
Dios te ampare y dé consuelo;  
que soy pobre, como sabes,  
y he de buscar mi remedio.                    240

Váyase Dinarco.

Filelfo                Si las cosas de tu estado  
tuvieran otro Filelfo  
que las supiera entender,  
en él que tú las has puesto,<sup>1</sup>  
yo me quedara contigo;                    245  
tú sabes que yo no puedo:  
dame licencia y tus manos.

Duquesa               Amigo, yo te agradezco  
que con el Duque te vuelvas.

Filelfo                Por lo que digo me vuelvo:                    250  
el cielo te dé su amparo.

Váyase Filelfo.



Urbino Aunque pudiera el ejemplo  
destos bárbaros moverme,  
antes su ejemplo condeno;  
servirle como a ti misma 255  
al señor Antonio quiero:  
quien mereció ser tu esposo,  
¿por qué no será mi dueño?  
De rodillas le suplico,  
si con amor o con celos 260  
algún disgusto le hice,<sup>1</sup>  
me perdone.

Antonio Alzad del suelo,  
alzado, Urbino, que yo  
os tuve siempre y os tengo,  
por amigo y por hermano. 265

Duquesa Urbino, obligada quedo  
a vuestro amor; y así, os juro  
por la vida que deseo  
a mi esposo, de mostrarme  
agradecida en extremo. 270

Urbino Señora, Vuestra Excelencia...

Duquesa Ya las Excelencias dejo;  
ya tiene su Duque Amalfi;  
lo que es mi Antonio ser quiero;  
no quiero estados ni vida; 275  
suya soy. Libia, muy presto  
te casaré con Urbino;  
que aunque pobre<sup>2</sup> y sola quedo,  
yo tengo para tu dote.

Libia Tus pies y tus manos beso, 280  
que sólo servirte es paga;  
la misma sangre te ofrezco,  
si llegare la ocasión.

Duquesa Doristo, vos lo habéis hecho  
como muy hombre de bien; 285  
mudad el traje; que quiero  
que me acompañéis.

Doristo Señora,  
de que vos lo estéis me alegro.

1. B, C, primary text: hace2. A, B: pobra

Aunque quisieran echarme,  
no me fuera de con ellos; 290  
Que estos ángeles, mis hijos,  
con su amor me tienen preso.  
Aunque me dieran mil palos,  
me dejara como un perro  
matar en estos umbrales, 295  
con ansia de no perdellos.

Duquesa Ya es razón, Antonio mío,  
que otros vestidos les demos.

Antonio Ya es razón, pues ya se sabe,  
mi señora, que son vuestros. 300

Duquesa Pues vamos, y vuestra hacienda  
con la que traigo juntemos;  
que para dos que se quieren,  
es la riqueza lo menos.  
Pondremos nuestra casilla; 305  
que con vos, mi bien eterno,  
una ropa de sayal,  
una camisa de angeo,<sup>1</sup>  
serán telas de Milán,  
serán cambrayes flamencos. 310

Antonio Con lágrimas os respondo,  
que con palabras no puedo.

Váyanse.

Salgan Julio de Aragón y Otavio de Médicis.

Julio Si lo supiese el Cardenal mi hermano,  
¡por los cielos, Otavio, que sospecho  
que todo el mundo resistiese en vano, 315  
que no le hiciese atravesar el pecho!

Otavio El hecho ha sido, Julio, más liviano  
que fue jamás de noble mujer hecho.  
¿Con su criado, con Antonio?

Julio ¡Ay, loca,  
de poca edad y de vergüenza poca! 320

Otavio Antonio de Bolonia es hijodalgo,  
mas desigual para tan gran señora.

Julio No lo dudéis, que de sentido salgo.  
¡Cuñado nuestro ¡un hombre humilde agora!



Si de locuras del amor me valgo,  
que bien es cierto que al infame adora,  
hiciéranos la ofensa de secreto,  
y su deseo vil tuviera efeto;  
pero casarse tan desatinada,  
que dejase su casa, hijo y estado,  
no puede ser locura disculpada,  
ni este yerro de amor jamás dorado.  
Hoy la sangre Aragón queda afrentada  
con la bajeza de tan vil cuñado;  
mas yo me vengaré por propia mano,  
sin que lo sepa el Cardenal, mi hermano.  
¡Viven los cielos, que es infamia nuestra  
que tenga padre el Duque, mi sobrino,  
Antonio, vil en la bajeza vuestra,  
y que sólo en pensarlo desatino!

Otavio Pues Julio de Aragón, mi mano diestra,  
para hacer la venganza que imagino,  
como Médicis que doy, y como amante  
que ve la infamia y deshonor delante.  
Por seguros que vivan en Ancona,  
hay criados, pistolas y soldados,  
o yo le mataré por mi persona.

Julio Para eso, Otavio, sobrarán criados.  
Mientras más lo imagino, me apasiona  
con más rigor, que hermanos desdichados.

Otavio Pues los que al Duque han dado son muy buenos.

Julio No merecen vivir de infamia llenos.

Otavio En un monte los tuvo con secreto,  
en hábito de rústicos villanos.

Julio ¡Qué graciosos hermanos, en efeto,  
para ser de un señor tan grande hermanos!  
Pero vamos, Otavio; que os prometo  
hacer venganza con mis propias manos.  
¡Ay, traidora Duquesa!

Otavio ¡Ay, mi Duquesa!  
¡Antonio ha de morir: por ti me pesa!

Váyanse.

.  
 . Salgan el Duque de Amalfi, hijo de la Duquesa, Furio,  
Dinarco y Filelfo.

Amalfi	Ya lo sabe el Cardenal, todos mis deudos y tíos.	
Furio	Todos lo tienen por mal que hiciese estos desvaríos una mujer principal.	365
Amalfi	¿Cómo que mi madre hiciese un desatino que fuese <sup>1</sup> de nuestra sangre deshonra, que ni mi amor ni su honra la ejecución resistiese? ¡Válame Dios! Más querría a éste su Antonio que a mí. ¡Desdichada madre mía! ¡Oh, si cuando yo nací, muriera aquel mismo día!	370       375
Filelfo	Vuestra Excelencia, señor, no se fatigue ni acabe con la fuerza del dolor.	
Amalfi	Quien eso dice, no sabe que fuerza tiene el honor: ocho años ha durado esta infamia con secreto.	380
Dinarco	De algunos fue murmurado; mas por temor, en efeto, fue de los mismos callado. Señales hartas se vieron; Otavio dijo mil cosas, aunque nunca se creyeron; que mucho más poderosas, señor, las virtudes fueron que en mi señora se vían.	385       390
Amalfi	Todas fingidas serían, ¿yo tengo padastro? ¿Yo soy hijo de Antonio?	
Furio	No; que no lo son los que crían, sino aquéllos que dan ser.	395

1.C:fue



- Amalfi Ya que con él se casó,  
que, en efeto, fue mujer,  
y como mujer erró,  
que no hay más que encarecer, 400  
fuera madre para mí;  
no me despreciara ansí,  
ni me dejara sin verme;  
no soy grande para hacerme  
esos amores a mí. 405
- Allá, a los hijos de Antonio  
tendrá amor, pues fue a su gusto  
ese bajo matrimonio.
- Filelfo ¿Ya te dan celos disgusto?  
Amalfi ¿Yo celos? Es testimonio. 410  
¡Vive Dios que los pusiera  
en el alma a mis hermanos  
si aquí presentes los viera!  
Que no serán tan villanos,  
si esto bien se considera. 415  
Antonio, ¿no es caballero?  
Furio Sí, señor.
- Amalfi Pues de mi madre  
la parte que darles quiero,  
supliera la de su padre  
si fuera un bajo escudero. 420  
Escribid ¡por vida mía!  
a mis tíos grandes honras  
de Antonio.
- Dinarco ¡Bien haya el día  
que naciste!
- Amalfi Estas deshonras  
cubrid con justa osadía. 425  
Decid grandes bienes dél;  
que yo pienso, de mi parte,  
esmerarme hablando en él.
- Furio Mil gracias queremos darte,  
señor, por ella y por él. 430
- Amalfi Nadie diga en casa mal  
de Antonio, o sálgase della.
- Furio ¡Qué nobleza! ¿Hay cosa igual?

- Amalfi                    Pues bien será socorella,  
amigos, en tiempo tal.                    435  
¿Qué llevó?
- Dinarco                    Sola su plata,  
joyas, camas y vestidos.
- Amalfi                    ¿No más?
- Dinarco                    De aquesto se trata.
- Amalfi                    ¡Qué amores tan bien seguidos!  
Los de otro tiempo retrata.                    440  
Veinticinco mil ducados,  
buscad, aunque sean prestados,  
y para poner su casa  
los llevad.
- Furio                    Tu piedad pasa  
a los ejemplos pasados.                    445
- Amalfi                    Cinco mil a mis hermanos  
les llevad para vestidos;  
dejen los suyos villanos.
- Dinarco                    De escucharte están corridos,  
griegos, persas y romanos.                    450
- Amalfi                    Pues vamos, y escribiremos  
a cuantos deudos tenemos  
de nuestra casa Aragón,  
que será justa razón  
que al señor Antonio honremos.                    455  
Llamadle al señor Antonio,  
pues la goza en matrimonio.  
¡Ay, Duquesa! ¿Quién te culpa,  
si ser mujer te disculpa,  
y luego amor, que es demonio?                    460
- Váyanse.
- Salgan la Duquesa, Antonio y Urbino.
- Urbino                    Conviene que a toda furia  
huyáis los dos, porque creo  
que vienen con gran deseo  
de satisfacer su injuria.  
Y aquí veréis si es verdad                    465  
lo que os avisé en Ancona.
- Duquesa                    ¿Mi sangre no te perdona?  
¿En mi sangre no hay piedad?  
Mis hermanos me persiguen;  
ya, ¿qué me pueden querer?                    470



- Antonio La causa debo de ser.
- Duquesa Otras hay que los obliguen,  
Antonio, a tener piedad.
- Antonio Como a Venecia lleguemos,  
de nuestras vidas tendremos 475  
seguro en su libertad.  
De su república espero,  
señora, grande favor.
- Urbino Caminad con más furor,  
porque viene el mundo entero. 480
- Duquesa No podré mientras no vienen  
mis hijos.<sup>1</sup>
- Urbino Ya están aquí.
- Salen Libia y los niños.
- Libia Caminad, ¡triste de mí!  
si los pies los que temen tienen;  
que un hombre nos ha contado 485  
que al pasar de aquesta fuente,  
vio en aquel bosque, de gente  
todo un escuadrón formado.  
Sin duda no saben bien  
el designio que lleváis, 490  
y si tan despacio os vais,<sup>2</sup>  
haréis que aviso les den.
- Duquesa ¡Ay, hijos del alma mía,  
sólo aguardaba a los dos!
- Sale Celso.
- Celso Huid, señores, por Dios, 495  
que habemos visto un espía  
que esta senda atravesó,  
y como nos vio, se fue.
- Antonio ¿Iba a caballo o a pie?
- Celso A pie, señores, pasó, 500  
con un arcabuz, volviendo  
por momentos la cabeza.
- Sale Doristo, ya de escudero.
- Doristo Id, señores, con presteza  
la vecina muerte huyendo;

1. B, C, primary text: ¿No podré mientras no vienen/mis hijos?

2. C: despacio estáis

	que en ese cerro subido, vi por el llano marchando gente que os viene buscando.	505
Duquesa	Huye, mi Antonio querido; huye, mi bien, porque a mí, ¿qué mal me ha de hacer mi hermano? A ti te busca el tirano; vengarse quiere de ti.	510
Doristo	Señor, aunque ayer vivía en un monte, labrador, sabed que sé qué es honor; y que sé qué es cobardía; ninguna es agora huir, si el mundo os viene a buscar.	515
Antonio	¿No veis que siento el dejar mi esposa más que el morir?	520
Celso	Si creéis a aquestas <sup>1</sup> canas, huir os dan por consejo; creed esta vez a un viejo, y más en cosas tan llanas. Urbino se queda aquí; yo me quedo aquí también.	525
Duquesa	Huid, mi señor, mi bien; huid, y doleos de mí; no me dejéis sin marido, ni a vuestros hijos sin padre.	530
Alejandro	Señor, bien dice mi madre, yo también que huya le pido; huya, pues podrá volver, y no se deje matar.	
Leonora	Padre, ¿qué quiere aguardar?	535
Antonio	Hija, quiéroos defender?	
Leonora	Con eso, a todos nos mata.	
Antonio	Pues, hijos del alma mía, si aquesto no es cobardía, mi sangre a la vuestra ingrata, quedaos con Dios, Él os guarde; estos abrazos tomad, y estas lágrimas llevad, que es bien que lllore un cobarde.	540

1. A, B, C: creéis aquestas canas



Y vos, dulcísimo bien 545  
 de mi esperanza y mi vida,  
 perdonad aquesta huida,  
 pues me lo mandáis también.  
 Adiós, Libia; adiós Urbino;  
 mi Doristo y Celso, adiós. 550

Duquesa El alma lleváis con vos.

Antonio ¡Qué desdichado camino!

Váyase Antonio.

Duquesa Hijos, allegaos a mí,  
 que lo habré bien menester.

Leonora Luego, ¿ya no le ha de ver? 555

Duquesa No sé, sin dicha nací.

Alejandro Calla, señora; que yo  
 iré a hablar al Cardenal,  
 mi tío.

Duquesa No digas tal,  
 pues ya su sangre negó. 560

Alejandro A fe que, si edad tuviera,  
 que a Julio desafiara.

Duquesa Ya el cielo sólo<sup>1</sup> me ampara.

Leonora Señora, en el cielo espera.

Duquesa Mi hijo, el Duque, me deja; 565  
 Julio de Aragón me sigue,  
 el Cardenal me persigue,  
 mi Antonio de mí se aleja;  
 pues venga la muerte ya,  
 que es el remedio postrero. 570

Leonora Madre mía, en Dios espero  
 que su piedad mostrará.

Sale Julio de Aragón y Otavio con cuatro criados  
 con arcabuces y alabardas.

Otavio Éstos, sin duda, son.

Julio Teneos, cobardes,  
 viles, ribaldos, fementidos, locos;  
 teneos a la furia de mi ofensa. 575

Duquesa Aquí, ¿quién se defiende, hermano mío?

Julio ¿Yo soy tu hermano? ¿Yo? ¿Qué dices, bárbara?

1. A, B: ya sólo el cielo

Duquesa ¿No eres tú Julio de Aragón?

Julio Él mismo.

Duquesa Pues, ¿no soy yo tu hermana?

Julio No, villana;

la Duquesa de Amalfi, que ya es muerta, 580  
era mi hermana.

Duquesa Pues, ¿no soy la misma?

¡Oh, qué graciosa cosa! Otavio, escucha:  
que la mujer de Antonio de Bolonia  
me dice que es mi hermana, y se ha fingido  
la Duquesa de Amalfi.

Otavio No pudiera 585

la Duquesa de Amalfi haber pensado,  
cuanto más cometido, tal bajeza.

Duquesa ¿Que tú vienes aquí?

Otavio Pues, ¿quién pensabas?

Duquesa ¿De qué te toca a ti la sangre nuestra?

¿No eres Médicis tú?

Otavio Sí, yo soy Médicis; 590

sangre en que ha habido reyes y pontífices.

Duquesa ¿Por dónde tienes tú los Aragones?

Otavio Por amistad, que es la más noble sangre  
y el cuartel de las armas de más honra.

Duquesa ¿Aquí paró tu amor?

Otavio Aun no ha parado, 595

ni parará mientras la causa vive.

Duquesa Hermano, ¡oh, Julio! ¿qué es lo que me quieres?

Julio ¿Quién son aquestos niños?

Duquesa Tus sobrinos.

Julio ¿Cómo sobrinos? Uno solo tengo,  
que es el Duque de Amalfi, y éste es hijo 600  
de un hombre que era igual a nuestra sangre.

Duquesa Éstos lo son de un hombre que no tiene  
igual en la virtud ni el ingenio,  
de que es claro testigo toda Italia;  
y estos niños que ves y que desprecias, 605  
si no son tus sobrinos, son mis hijos;  
y si no tienen padre, basta el cielo;  
que el cielo cubre a quien desprecia el hombre.  
Julio También castiga el cielo a quien le ofende.



Duquesa Yo me casé por voluntad del cielo. 610  
 Julio Voluntad que le ofende, ¿en qué le sirve?  
 Duquesa Más yerro fuera no me haber casado.  
 Julio Más secreta estuviera nuestra infamia.  
 Duquesa Casada yo, ¿qué infamia te resulta?  
 Otavio Déjate de argüir con quien te ofende. 615  
 Duquesa Nunca juzgaron bien de amor los celos.  
 Otavio No soy celoso yo, sino ofendido.  
 Duquesa Pues, ¿cuando fui yo tuya? ¿Qué te ofendo?  
 Otavio ¿No basta que engañaste mi esperanza?  
 Duquesa No es esperanza confianza loca. 620  
 Julio Ahora bien: ¿dónde queda tu marido,  
 ése que llamas el señor Antonio?  
 Duquesa Ese señor Antonio, y mi marido,  
 está en Milán.  
 Julio ¿Que no venía contigo?  
 Duquesa No, que supo muy bien vuestras crueldades. 625  
 Julio No importa, dondequiera tendrá amigos  
 el Cardenal, y yo también los tengo.  
 Ven presa.  
 Duquesa ¿Presa yo?  
 Julio ¿Pues, eso dudas?  
 Duquesa Pues, ¿tú puedes prenderme? ¿Por qué causa?  
 Julio No es causa la deshonra y desventura 630  
 de la casa Aragón?<sup>1</sup>  
 Duquesa Pues, ¿con qué orden?  
 ¿Del Rey o del Pontífice?  
 Julio Camina.  
 Y éstos, ¿quién son?  
 Urbino Yo soy su secretario.  
 Julio ¿Por qué dejaste al Duque?  
 Urbino No he servido  
 al Duque, sino sólo a mi señora. 635  
 Julio ¿Quién eres tú?  
 Celso Quien la crió, y la sirve  
 de bracero más ha de catorce años.  
 Julio Y tú, ¿quién eres?  
 Doristo Amo destos niños:  
 ayer pastor de un monte y cuatro ovejas,  
 y hoy cortesano para tal desdicha. 640

1. D: casa de Aragón

Julio               Vamos, Otavio; que el traidor se ha ido  
con aviso que tuvo.

Otavio                               Dime, Urbino:

¿tú eres también deste delito cómplice?

Urbino           Yo no tengo el casarse por delito.

Otavio           ¿No es delito infamar a tantos príncipes       645  
una mujer?

Julio               Dejemos eso agora;  
váyase él que quisiere; que aquí sólo  
se prende a esta mujer y sus dos hijos.

Duquesa           ¿Qué culpa tienen estos inocentes?

Alejandro       ¿A nosotros nos prende, señor tío?               650

Julio            ¿Yo tío? ¿Hay desvergüenza semejante?  
A Amalfi caminad.

Duquesa                               No importa nada;  
ya sé que me queréis tener cautiva;  
matadme, y el señor Antonio viva.

Váyanse, y entre Antonio.

Antonio           ¿Dónde me lleva mi suerte                       655  
con tan vergonzosa huida,  
desamparando la vida  
por el temor de la muerte?  
¡Triste de mí! ¿Dónde voy,  
dejando el alma en las manos                       660  
de aquellos fieros tiranos,  
a quien cuatro vidas doy?  
La de mi amada mujer,  
de mi Alejandro y Leonora,  
hijos que mi alma adora,                               665  
y la que está por nacer.  
¿Cuál hombre, de un alto estado  
ha venido a tal bajeza?  
¿Dónde hallará fortaleza  
corazón tan desdichado?                               670  
¿Cómo podré yo tener  
ánimo, viendo perdidas  
cuatro tan amadas vidas  
de mis hijos y mujer?  
Que si no me engañan señas,                       675  
todo es ya perdido:



tentaciones me han venido  
de arrojarme destas peñas.  
¡Cielos, tenedme las manos!  
¡Quitadme las armas, cielos;  
que entre tantos desconsuelos  
no valen medios humanos!  
¡Ay de mí! ¿Si los han muerto  
con la furia del enojo?  
¿Cómo de aquí no me arrojo?  
¿Qué más justo desconcierto?  
¿Dónde podré yo vivir,  
dulce Camila, sin vos?  
¿Quién nos aparta a los dos?  
¿Quién nos puede dividir?  
¡Ay, hijos, ay dulces prendas,  
para tanto mal halladas!

Sale Doristo.

Doristo            Pienso que van apartadas  
del real camino estas sendas;  
Mas con errar acerté.  
Señor Antonio.

Antonio

Doristo,

¿es posible que te he visto?

¿Que tal mi ventura fue?

¿Huiste?¿Desamparaste

mis hijos?¿Quedan ya muertos?

Doristo            Antes, de vivir más ciertos  
que en tu vida imaginaste,  
camino de Amalfi van;  
pienso que estarán en ella,  
donde a la Duquesa bella,  
todos parabienes dan.  
El Duque, su hijo, vino,  
y la salió a recibir.  
Yo los vi holgar y reír  
la más parte<sup>1</sup> del camino.  
Sus hermanos abrazó  
el Duque con gran contento.

1.D:las más partes

Y allí de tu casamiento,  
entre los dos se trató,  
donde Julio de Aragón,  
hermano de la Duquesa,  
muestra que de ver le pesa  
tu ausencia en esta ocasión.  
Que viendo al Duque con gusto,  
todos lo<sup>1</sup> tienen de verte,  
y le han jurado no hacerte  
eternamente disgusto.  
Aquesta carta es de Urbino.

Antonio Muestra, y dame mil abrazos;  
que del alma y de los brazos  
eres por mil cosas digno.  
¿Que ha sucedido tan bien?  
¿Que todo está en ese estado?

Doristo Yo digo lo que ha pasado,  
y lo que he visto también.

Antonio ¡Cielos, a piedad movidos,  
más seso habré menester  
para el presente placer,  
que en los males sucedidos!

Lea.

"Las cosas se han hecho de otra suerte que las imaginábamos: el Duque ha sido ángel de paz contra la furia de Julio de Aragón y Otavio de Médicis; no se aleje V.S., sino esté a la mira de lo que sucede, que espero en Dios le pondrá presto en descanso - Urbino Castelvetro".<sup>2</sup>

Antonio Papel de mi alma y vida;<sup>3</sup>  
mil veces quiero besaros,  
mas no sé qué hallazgo daros  
de mi esperanza perdida.  
Las lágrimas de placer  
en albricias recibid;  
esto de un pobre admitid,

1.A:le

2.C omits signature.

3.C:mi alma y mi vida



.  
 .  
 en tanto que os pueda hacer  
 una caja de oro y perlas,  
 porque en tales ocasiones,  
 merecen estas razones 745  
 dentro del alma ponerlas.<sup>1</sup>  
 Doristo, ¿que tanto bien  
 me hace el Duque, mi señor?  
 Doristo Templó del tío el furor,  
 y de otros deudos también, 750  
 y con entrañas abiertas  
 habla a su madre y hermanos.  
Sale Urbino.  
 Urbino ¡Con qué pensamientos vanos  
 voy por sendas tan inciertas!  
 Dudo que le pueda hallar, 755  
 y dejo el caballo muerto.  
 Antonio ¿Gente por este desierto?  
 Urbino Gente siento caminar.  
 ¡Válame Dios! ¿No es aquél  
 el señor Antonio?  
 Antonio ¡Ay, cielo! 760  
 ¿Si es Urbino aquél?  
 Doristo Recelo  
 que viene por vos, si es él.  
 Urbino ¡Señor Antonio!  
 Antonio ¡Mi Urbino!  
 ¿Qué es esto?  
 Urbino Vengo por vos,  
 y doy mil gracias a Dios 765  
 de haber errado el camino;  
 que por errarle os hallé.  
 Antonio ¿Por mí?  
 Urbino Por vos.  
 Antonio ¿De qué modo?  
 Urbino El Duque lo allana todo,  
 ángel destas paces fue; 770  
 como príncipe lo ha hecho;  
 sosegad el corazón;  
 que ya a Julio de Aragón

; tiene sosegado el pecho,  
 y aquesta carta os escribe, 775  
 porque también han llegado  
 cartas que le han obligado,  
 que por momentos recibe,  
 y entre ellas del Cardenal  
 que le manda que no os toque, 780  
 ni que a enojo le provoque;  
 porque sois muy principal,  
 y quiere honrarse de vos.  
 Antonio En fin, príncipe romano.  
 Urbino Leed, y vamos.  
 Antonio ¿Que está llano? 785  
 Todo está llano, ¡por Dios!

Lea.

"El Cardenal, mi hermano, me ha escrito que os deje en paz con vuestra mujer e hijos; venid por ellos, que con tal condición que os vais a vivir a España o Alemania, soy contento de dároslos".

Antonio ¿Cómo a España o a Alemania?  
 A Constantinopla iré;  
 que por mis hijos seré  
 parida tigre de Hircania. 790  
 Urbino, dame esos brazos.  
 ¡Dolióse el cielo de mí!  
 Urbino ¡Qué bien merezco de ti  
 esos amorosos lazos!  
 Vamos, señor, que me dio 795  
 mil recados.  
 Antonio ¡Ay, si yo  
 volar, Urbino, pudiera!  
 Pero caballos tomemos.  
 Doristo Yo os quiero servir de guía.  
 Urbino Camine Vuesefloría, 800  
 aunque mil postas matemos.

Váyanse, y salgan Otavio, Julio y el Duque de Amalfi.

Amalfi Toda mi vida estaré,  
 señor tío, agradecido  
 al favor que he recibido.



Julio	Serviros, sobrino, fue cosa muy puesta en razón; que si vos contento estáis deste agravio, sois quien dais a todos satisfacción.	805
Otavio	Ya, pues habemos comido juntos, no hay más que tratar del agravio, sino dar remedio a lo sucedido. Ayude el Duque a su madre, y a España se puede <sup>1</sup> ir.	810 815
Amalfi	Yo la quisiera servir con cuanto heredo a mi padre; pero, fuera de la hacienda vinculada al mayorazgo, como si fuera en hallazgo de alguna perdida prenda, le doy todo lo demás, <sup>2</sup> y que se vaya me pesa.	820
Julio	No ha de volver la Duquesa, sobrino, a Italia jamás.	825
Amalfi	No vuelva, pues no queréis.	
Julio	Otavio...	
Otavio	¿Qué me mandáis? <sup>3</sup>	
Julio	¿Para qué tanto os cansáis en los conciertos que hacéis? <sup>4</sup> Que ya tiene en la comida la Duquesa el justo pago de haber sido fiero estrago de nuestra sangre ofendida.	830
Otavio	¿Qué le habéis dado?	
Julio	No sé; mas no vivirá media hora.	835
Otavio	¡Ay, desdichada señora,	

1. A, D: pueden2. A, B, C: todos los demás3. A, B, C: ¿Qué mandáis?

4. D omits this line.

- .  
cuánto tu estrella lo fue!  
¡Ay, crueldad! ¡Ay, sinrazón!
- Julio Pues, ¿eso dices, Otavio,  
viendo tan notable agravio? 840
- Otavio No me basta el corazón;  
quísela, adoréla, ¡hoy muero!
- Julio Paso, ¡pesia el hombre, amén!  
No lo entienda el Duque.
- Otavio ¿Es bien  
que deis la muerte a un cordero,  
a un ángel? 845
- Julio ¡Paciencia, Otavio,  
que me echaréis a perder!  
Que no es ángel la mujer  
que hace a su sangre agravio,  
y por tan liviano antojo. 850
- Otavio Ello ha sido desvarío.
- Amalfi ¿Por qué os riñe Otavio, tío?  
¿No es acabado el enojo?
- Julio Díceme que bien pudiera  
vivir vuestra madre aquí. 855
- Amalfi Y dice bien; porque a mí  
de gran consuelo me fuera.  
Y si hay lugar, os lo ruego.
- Julio Digo que sea<sup>1</sup> por vos.
- Amalfi ¡Mil años os guarde Dios! 860
- Salen Urbino, Antonio y Doristo.
- Antonio Temblando a sus ojos llevo.
- Urbino Aquí está el señor Antonio.
- Antonio Aquí a vuestros pies estoy;  
que con mis lágrimas doy  
de mi humildad testimonio. 865
- Nunca creí mi bajeza,  
loco de tan alto empleo,  
como agora que me veo  
a los pies de Vuestra Alteza.
- Amalfi Antonio, pues ya mi madre  
como a padre te me dio,  
bien puedo llamarte yo  
una y muchas veces padre. 870



Antonio	¿Padre, señor? No soy hombre que de vos serlo merezco: esclavo sí; y ansí ofrezco a esos pies mi humilde nombre.	875
Amalfi	Álzate Antonio; no es bien que estés <sup>1</sup> ansí, ya que Dios puso en estado a los dos, que soy tu menor también. Fía de mi voluntad, que te estimo como a padre; que a mí me dio ser mi madre, y a ti te dio calidad. Yo quiero lo que ella quiere; yo estimo lo que ella estima.	880  885
Antonio	Mucho tu piedad me anima para que remedio espere.	
Amalfi	Besa a mi tío las manos, que a todos hace merced.	890
Antonio	Vuestra intercesión poned con príncipes tan cristianos. Id delante, gran señor.	
Amalfi	Tío aquí viene.	
Julio	Ya sé quien viene; yo le hablaré.	895
Amalfi	Pues, mostralde mucho amor.	
Antonio	Señor, si Vuestra Excelencia está ofendido de mí, mi vida humilde está aquí.	900
Julio	¡Ah, Dios, que tengo paciencia! El Cardenal me ha mandado, Antonio, y lo quiero hacer, que os deje a vuestra mujer; hace lo que está obligado. Entrad en ese aposento, y tratad vuestra partida.	905
Antonio	¡Señor, esta humilde vida a vuestra piedad presento!	
Julio	Álzate, que tu mujer te quiere ver.	910
Antonio	Voy, señor,	

a recibir el favor  
que ya me queréis hacer.  
¡Prosperere el cielo la vida  
vuestra y la de su Excelencia! 915  
Tú has mostrado tu prudencia.

Antonio ¡Jesús!

Urbino ¡Qué extraña caída!

Julio ¿Qué fue?

Otavio Cayó Antonio entrando.

Julio Será de mucho placer.

Antonio Algo me ha de suceder. 920

Váyase Antonio.

Julio Aquí os están esperando.

Amalfi Yo os prometo, señor tío,  
que os estoy muy obligado.

Otavio ¿Que es posible que yo he dado  
ayuda a tal desvarío? 925

Perdiendo estoy de dolor

el juicio; mas ya viene

Camila; sereno tiene

el rostro y de buen color;

sin duda que me ha engañado 930

Julio, viendo mi afición.

Salen la Duquesa y Libia.

Duquesa ¿Que ciertas las nuevas son?

Libia Todos dicen que ha llegado.

Duquesa A ver a Antonio venía,  
que me dicen que está aquí. 935

Amalfi ¿No le has visto?

Duquesa No le vi.

Libia Algún engaño sería.

Amalfi Agora, señora, entró:  
el camino habéis errado.

Sale Fenicio, criado de Julio.

Fenicio Aquello está ejecutado. 940

Julio ¿Que no le has visto?

Duquesa Yo no.

Amalfi Tú le saliste a buscar  
cuando él mismo entraba a verte.

Duquesa Pues, señores, desahogada suerte  
váyale un paje a llamar. 945



- Amalfi ¡Hola! Llamad a mi padre.
- Julio ¿Cómo le das ese nombre  
a la bajeza de un hombre  
que ha hecho infame a tu madre?
- Amalfi ¿Agora tenemos eso? 950  
¿No estaba esto<sup>1</sup> acabado?
- Julio Y tanto que fin se ha dado  
a la infamia del suceso.  
Camila, si quieres ver  
tus hijos y tu marido, 955  
digo, aquel hombre atrevido  
que te llamó su mujer,  
abrid aquese aposento  
y entregádselos; que es justo  
que al Cardenal demos gusto 960  
y a mi sobrino contento;  
y apercíbete a morir;  
que tienes el pecho lleno  
de un abrasador<sup>2</sup> veneno.  
Ea, ¿no acabáis de abrir? 965
- Ábranse dos puertas y véase una mesa con tres platos;  
en él de en medio la cabeza de Antonio, y a los lados  
las de los dos niños.
- Duquesa ¿Cuya fuera esta crueldad  
sino de un infame monstruo,  
que con palabras fingidas  
ha dado muerte a mi esposo?  
¡De Dios te venga el castigo! 970  
¡Hijos, pidámosle todos!  
¡Clamad, inocentes niños!  
¡Ángeles del alto coro,  
volved por los de la tierra!  
¡Justicia, Padre piadoso! 975  
¡Alejandro, Abel, Leonora,  
niña y niña de mis ojos,  
marido y señor del alma,  
Antonio, querido Antonio!
- Julio ¡Obró el veneno: cayó! 980

1. B: aquesto2. Primary text: abrasado

Otavio            ¿Esto he visto o son antojos?  
                     ¡Ah, cielo! Pues ojos tienes,  
                     ¿cómo no ves esto? ¿Y cómo,  
                     si tienes tantos oídos,  
                     estás a<sup>1</sup> este llanto sordo?  
                     ¿Para qué quiero la vida?

Julio            ¿Qué es esto, Otavio, estás loco?

Otavio            ¡Loco estoy!

**Julio**                      ¿La capa dejas?

Otavio            Muerto mi bien,vaya todo;  
que si se anega la nave,  
a la mar la hacienda arrojo.  
¡Camila,Camila mía!

990

Váyase furioso Otavio.

Amalfi           ¿Qué miras,tigre furioso?  
                    ¿Qué miras,león albano?  
                    ¿Qué miras,español toro?                                 995  
                    ¡Saca la espada,cobarde;  
                    que desde la punta al pomo  
                    teñiré en tu sangre aquésta!

**Julio**            Sobrino,habláis como mozo;  
yo he vuelto por vuestro honor,  
y esta venganza que tomo,  
a vuestra cuenta se ha hecho.

1000

Váyase Julio.

[illegible]

Urbino            Aquí dio fin la tragedia,  
                    Senado, del Mayordomo,  
                    que como pasó en Italia,  
                    hoy la han visto vuestros ojos.

Fin de la famosa comedia de El mayordomo de la Duquesa  
de Amalfi.



Notes to the Text

Abbreviations used

<u>Autoridades</u>	<u>Diccionario de la lengua castellana...</u> <u>por la Real Academia Española</u> (Madrid, 1726-1739).
<u>Corominas</u>	<u>Diccionario etimológico de la lengua</u> <u>castellana</u> , 3 vols (Madrid, 1954).
<u>Correas</u>	<u>Vocabulario de refranes y frases</u> <u>proverbiales</u> , collected by Gonzalo de Correas Íñigo (published Madrid, 1924).
<u>Covarrubias</u>	<u>Tesoro de la lengua castellana</u> , Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco (Madrid, 1611).

Acto primero

- 1-14      An indirect reference to the Icarus myth. Allusions to Icarus as an embodiment of presumption, frequent enough in Golden Age literature generally, are particularly common in Lope's social climber plays.
- 70        a figura estoy: "I'm expecting the worst"; "estar a figura es en el juego de los naipes esperar la más ruin carta del manjar" (Covarrubias).
- 97        mes de mesa is probably a mis-transcription of mes de miesa, "harvest month"; "mies: acción de cosechar o conjunto de cereales cosechados...se halla /también/ una forma miesa con terminación alterada por el género femenino" (Corominas).
- 104      accidente: "attack of passion"; "la enfermedad o indisposición que sobreviene y acomete, o repentinamente o causada de nuevo" (Autoridades).

- 110            cometa: "kite".
- 151-153        A fe de hidalgo/de hacer...: "modo adverbial para afirmar alguna cosa con ahinco o eficacia, que no llega a ser juramento y equivale a por mi fe" (Autoridades).
- 164            tabla: "plank" (of a wrecked ship); "se toma ...por alguna pequeña parte del navío u otra embarcación derrotada, y así se dice escaparse en una tabla" (Autoridades).
- 183            príncipe: "el grande de algún reino o monarquía, que es principal y tiene el primer voto en el manejo o gobierno" (Autoridades).
- 197            Rodamonte: one of the heroes of Ariosto's Orlando furioso (published 1516, translated into Spanish 1550).
- 286-289        An allusion to the Prometheus myth. The satyrs were the first earthly creatures to whom Prometheus revealed fire, and Silenus reacted by trying to kiss it (Robert Lancelyn Green, Heroes of Greece and Troy, London, 1960, p.35). It is illustrated also by one of Juan de Orozco y Covarrubias's emblems, which shows a peasant holding a satyr back from the fire. The moral point is that caution is necessary when approaching the unknown:
- Detente, no te fíes, que es la muerte  
la claridad que ves, y la hermosura,  
y si te llegas no podrás valerte.  
Emblemas morales, 1589, III, 33.
- 324            figura: "face"; "tómase...principalmente por el rostro" (Covarrubias).
- 332-333        "it must be because I have been received by you before in the presence of others"; "estrado



es el lugar donde las señoras se asientan sobre cojines y reciben las visitas" (Covarrubias).

412 "Otavio's love does him credit"; "abonar es aprobar y dar por buena alguna cosa" (Autoridades).

494 Quien suelta los cabellos; "he who lets an opportunity slip through his fingers"; "Tomar la ocasión por los cabellos...vale buscar un leve o aparente pretexto para aprovecharse de la ocasión" (Autoridades). See also note to I.859.

501-503 "Since I once possessed this gift of fortune, how can I expect to attain it again [knowing, as I do] that love does not grant such a gift to the man who turns away from it when he could have enjoyed it?"

546-547 "And [on condition] that this talk of loving her has not been accompanied by any token [of marriage] which compromises you".

585-586 "Some day I [too] shall strike at you through what you hold most dear"; niñas de los ojos "metafóricamente se llama lo más estimado, delicado y digno de mayor cuidado" (Autoridades).

714-733 This passage touches on a point not developed subsequently. Evidently, the Duchess's brothers are planning a marital alliance with the principal family of Ferrara, intending to use either their sister or her young son for this purpose.

808-827

There are three puns in this passage. Antonio first plays upon the double sense of corazón, "heart" and "centre" (807-810): "the paper was fashioned from your heart and that heart was my name because it was written at the heart of the paper". He then juggles with the two meanings of mano, "hand" and "sheaf of papers" ("una de las partes en que se divide la resma de papel", Autoridades): "using only seven letters you have written enough papers to fill a hand, because the hand which comes with this paper is the hand which you are offering me [In marriage], but I am unlucky since the hand offered is only, after all, a handful of paper, and the signature that of a [fickle] woman" (811-818). The passage ends with a complicated pun on blanco, en blanco and en lo blanco (819-826): "if only... our mutual commitment could be written on that blank paper (en lo blanco). Your filling that blank with my name was a joke since, in mourning for my death, my mad desire wears black, while my unhappy fate, which has drawn a blank (en blanco muestra) wears the colour of blankness" (i.e. blanco).

832

dilate is probably a mis-transcription of delate (delatar, to denounce): "should [I allow] audacity to quell my humility?"

843

sin ellos refers once again to los cabellos de la ocasión (see notes to I.494 and I.859). In this instance the metaphor is complicated by an allusion to Absalom's hair, which was a symbol of punishable vanity. Antonio means that, having lost his grip on los cabellos de la ocasión, he will die, just as Absalom died when ensnared by his own golden locks.



858

a ocasión la pintan calva: "make hay while the sun shines". Pedro de Mexía notes that the Ancients represented Chance as a woman who was bald except for one tail of hair which flowed down her forehead and over her face: "tiene cabellos en la frente porque cuando se ofrece, la asga y prenda de ellos él que de ella quiere gozar... y es calva y sin cabello el cerebro y parte postrera de la cabeza, porque en pasando no hay de qué asirla... significando que él que pierde... la ocasión buena para obrar, en pasando no la puede tornar a tomar" (Silva de varia lección, II, 290). Hence the expression tomar la ocasión por los cabellos.

903

dando vueltas a la vela: "circling the flame" (instead of flying straight into it).

947

puesto que "vale lo mismo que aunque" (Autoridades).

990-991

A variant on the proverb "Aún no sois salido del cascarón, ya no tenéis presunción"; "Don't run before you walk".

992-995

Traditionally marital theorists had always recommended that women be married at about the age of fifteen, and men between the ages of thirty and forty. Sixteenth-century writers on marriage tended, however, to disapprove of this wide age gap (see, for example, Pedro de Luján, Coloquios matrimoniales, 1550, f. xix<sup>r</sup>). Almost certainly Lope's century would have regarded Melampo's opinion as comical. El villano en su rincón provides another example of a

- dictatorial old peasant being shown in an absurd light by his voicing of the celibacy-until-the-age-of-forty argument (III.334-348).
- 1035 taita: "nombre con que el niño hace cariños, llamando a su padre" (Autoridades).
- 1036 un quillotro: "something or other"; "palabra rústica, vale aquel otro" (Covarrubias).
- 1042 "I'm determined to go my own way, that's all"; "navegar amurado /vale/ expuesto en absoluto o bien determinado" (Diccionario marítimo español, Madrid, 1831).
- 1097 adrede "vale lo mismo que a sabiendas" (Covarrubias).
- 1101 dimuño: "lo mismo que demonio. Es voz corrompida por ignorancia o jocosidad" (Autoridades).
- 1104 sobra: "offence"; "demasía, injuria, agravio" (Autoridades).
- 1140 monte: "woods" or possibly "scrubland"; "Tierra cubierta de árboles que llaman monte alto, o de malezas, que llaman monte bajo" (Autoridades).
- 1142 padrino: "él que asiste y acompaña a él que va a tomar estado" (Autoridades).
- 1150 de priesa: "de prisa" (Covarrubias).



Acto segundo

- 71            no sólo soy privado:"no sólo no soy privado".
- 109          término:"forma o modo de portarse"(Autoridades).
- 110-111      Ethelfred and Zenobia numbered among the standard examples of virtuous women.They represented the ultimate in chastity because they were said to have shunned sexual intercourse with their husbands.
- 184-185      An allusion to the legends of Helen of Troy and La Cava.The beauty of these women caused catastrophe on a national scale.
- 187-202      los hijos de Latona:Apollo and Artemis,born of the union between Latona and Zeus.Apollo was associated with the sun and Artemis with the moon.Hence Antonio's next metaphor:  
"Come night and darken the earth;although my comparing [this child] to the moon is more likely to prevent you from casting down your veil.For since I must make her appear she cannot help but be your moon;but have no fear,she will not be able to illuminate you.Since I have to wrap my cloak around her,I must of necessity cover up her dazzling beauty".
- 274          en Árgel pone los pies:"he steps straight into captivity";Argel was a town on the coast of Africa but "algunas veces se toma [metafóricamente] por esclavitud"(Autoridades).
- 359-362      "it would not be amiss for me to use [your child] as my shield,so that you,in striking it,would avenge me all the better".

Acto segundo

- 71 no sólo soy privado:"no sólo no soy privado".
- 109 término:"forma o modo de portarse"(Autoridades).
- 110-111 Ethelfred and Zenobia numbered among the standard examples of virtuous women.They represented the ultimate in chastity because they were said to have shunned sexual intercourse with their husbands.
- 184-185 An allusion to the legends of Helen of Troy and La Cava.The beauty of these women caused catastrophe on a national scale.
- 187-202 los hijos de Latona:Apollo and Artemis,born of the union between Latona and Zeus.Apollo was associated with the sun and Artemis with the moon.Hence Antonio's next metaphor:  
"Come night and darken the earth;although my comparing [this child] to the moon is more likely to prevent you from casting down your veil.For since I must make her appear she cannot help but be your moon;but have no fear,she will not be able to illuminate you.Since I have to wrap my cloak around her,I must of necessity cover up her dazzling beauty".
- 274 en Árgel pone los pies:"he steps straight into captivity";Argel was a town on the coast of Africa but "algunas veces se toma [metafóricamente] por esclavitud"(Autoridades).
- 359-362 "it would not be amiss for me to use [your child] as my shield,so that you,in striking it,would avenge me all the better".



- 433 conceto is a pun. Antonio's daughter is his book of secrets; her own conception (conceto "se suele tomar también por feto", Autoridades) is the key witticism (conceto, "conceit") in this book.
- 447 A la villa tengo de ir, cf. the ballad "Llamábalo la doncella"? One of its most popular versions features the refrain "Al ganado tengo de ir", see José M. Alín, El cancionero español de tipo tradicional (Madrid, 1968), p. 479.
- 473 cobre: "string of onions or garlic"; espetera: "set of kitchen hooks".
- 474 vasar: "stone dresser".
- 477 almírez: "mortar"; mano: "pestle".
- 478 alnafe: "stove".
- 483 migas: a rustic dish made from bread crumbs, oil, garlic, pepper and - evidently - bacon (tocino).
- 486 alabarda: "halberd"; pollino ("asno joven y cerril", Autoridades) is probably a mis-transcription of pollito, "young man".
- 487 berros: "watercress"; anapelos: a poisonous plant which grows among watercress. Correas notes the proverb "tú que coges el berro guárdate del anapelo", "Debemos obrar con cautela... entre lo que de suyo es bueno, como el berro, no mezclamos lo dañoso y mortífero, como el anapelo".

527-530

"he sees them with their little box and their mirror, painting and embellishing their faces, and a woman in the making is a sight terrible to behold".

538

porque hay mosca, pelo y palo sounds like a proverb, but I have not been able to find it listed as such. It seems that mosca and pelo were popularly used to illustrate the idea of smallness: "Su colerilla tiene cualquier mosca; / sombra, aunque poca, hace cualquier pelo;" (Francisco de Quevedo, "A un hipócrita de perenne valentía", Obra poética, ed. J.M. Blecua (Madrid, 1969), II, 43). Doristo might therefore mean something like "one small annoyance after another will drive a man to use his stick".

561-562

"by the time the first heaps of rough corn / are ready / he will have his foot on the threshing machine".

590

higa: "amuleto con que vanamente se persuadían los gentiles que se libraban del fascino del mal del ojo... la figura era de un mano, cerrado el puño, mostrando el dedo pulgar por entre el dedo índice y él de en medio... suelen ponerla a los niños" (Autoridades).

647-654

I have not found any picture which corresponds exactly with this description, although the symbols of which it is composed are common, and its overall meaning clear. The wise stoic attaches importance to neither success nor adversity.

725-734

It was commonly believed that the birth of a girl entailed greater physical pain, and augured more trouble than that of a boy: "que el parir hija trae más dolor naturalmente



que de hombre en el mismo parto...las hijas son nacidas y los hijos son nacidos"(Juan de Mal Lara,La filosofía vulgar,ed.A.Vilanova, II,194).The Duchess alludes briefly (733-734) to the origin of this notion:Eve's temptation of Adam.

765

torres de viento:"figments of a foolish imagination";"metafóricamente se llama el pensamiento o discurso con que alguna persona vanamente se persuade a sus conveniencias"(Autoridades).

825-865

The repeated use of quedo as a stage direction here is notable.It means "tanto como passito y con tiento"(Covarrubias).

913-915

Green was the colour of hope.See L.Fichter, "Colour Symbolism in Lope de Vega", Romanic Review,XVIII (1927),220-231,230.

925

"Fue Circe hechicera y encantadora de ventaja,y así se dice de ella que volvía los hombres en bestias fieras...todo esto se echó muy bien de ver en la transformación que hizo de los compañeros de Ulysses, volviéndolos en monstruos fieros"(Baltasar de Vitoria,El teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad (1676),I,636).

975-976

In this catalogue of impossible reversals of natural law the chameleon is associated with fire (because it was the salamander which was thought to survive in fire),and the salamander with wind (because it was the chameleon which was supposed to live on air).

977

Citia:Scythia,a province of North West Asia renowned for its cold climate.

.1087

Faustina was wife to the Roman Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, and was occasionally cited as an extreme example of feminine incontinence. Pedro Mexía tells how she fell in love with a gladiator and was not cured of her passion until she was given a cup of his blood to drink (Silva de varia lección, II, 73-74).



Acto tercero

- 86        cas: "lo mismo que casa" (Autoridades).
- 104       en agraz: "frase adverbial que explica que una cosa se ha perdido o malogrado fuera de sazón y tiempo" (Autoridades).
- 139       Petrarch's Triunfos were published in 1488, and translated into Spanish in 1512. The first section of the work deals with the "Triumph of Love", and it is this part to which the Duchess refers, relying on its fame to bring to mind the omnia vincit amor idea.
- 143       Semiramis was one of the standard illustrations of feminine evil. She was supposed to have taken many lovers from among her subjects and to have killed them once she had used them to satisfy her lust.
- 216       con ser: "aunque sea" (Autoridades).
- 308       angeo: "una tela de estopa o lino basto" (Covarrubias).
- 400       "there's no need to enlarge upon this any further".
- 410       testimonio: "test" (of the Duke's generosity); "se toma por prueba" (Autoridades).
- 637       bracero: the household official who acted as the lady's escort; "él que da el brazo a otro para que se apoye en él" (Autoridades).
- 691-692    Probably a deliberate echo of Garcilaso's sonnet "¡Oh dulces prendas por mi mal halladas!" (ed. T. Navarro Tomás, Madrid, 1924, 212).

- 769 allanar: "vencer reparos, embarazos, dificultades" (Autoridades).
- 790 The tigress of Hircania was frequently referred to as a ferocious creature with a strong maternal instinct. See, for example, Jerónimo Cortés, Libro y tratado de los animales terrestres (1613), 246-249.
- 884-885 The traditional notion that the noblewoman who married beneath herself could not share her status with either her husband or her children, was beginning to meet with opposition from about the middle of the sixteenth century. See my chapter five, pages 127-129.
- 1005 A noble belonging to a Military Order was entitled to wear a cross on his tunic.
- 1009 tusón: "fleece"; the Order of the Golden Fleece was the most prestigious in seventeenth-century Spain. It was instituted in 1492, and those who belonged to it wore a fleece as part of their ceremonial costume. The point of this ironic passage is that the young Duke is swearing by all the most sacred symbols of his noble status, to avenge a deed which is believed, by other members of the aristocracy, to have restored the honour necessary to his social standing.